

**COVENANT (בְּרִית) IN DANIEL AND THE
DEAD SEA SCROLLS:**

**AN EXPOSITION OF DANIEL 9-12 AND SELECTED
SECTIONS OF THE DAMASCUS DOCUMENT (CD),
COMMUNITY RULE (1QS), HYMNS SCROLL (1QH^A)
AND WAR SCROLL (1QM)**

By

SILVIA ANNELIESE LININGTON

Submitted in Accordance with the Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF THEOLOGY

in the Subject

OLD TESTAMENT

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

PROMOTER: PROF WS BOSHOFF

NOVEMBER 2014

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	3
Acknowledgements	7
Declaration	9
Summary	11
Key Words	11
Abbreviations	13
A. <i>Journals, Books, Electronic Resources & Publishers</i>	13
B. <i>Biblical Books, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha and Dead Sea Scrolls</i>	14
C. <i>Grammatical and General Abbreviations</i>	15
1 Introduction	17
1.1 <i>BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE FOR THIS RESEARCH</i>	17
1.2 <i>RESEARCH PROBLEM(S) AND OBJECTIVES</i>	17
1.3 <i>RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY</i>	19
1.4 <i>BRIEF SURVEY OF SOME OF THE LITERATURE USED</i>	20
2 Covenant in the Book of Daniel	25
2.1 <i>INTRODUCTION</i>	25
2.2 <i>SOME REMARKS ON THE GENRE(S), LANGUAGES, DATING, UNITY AND PURPOSE OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL</i>	25
2.2.1 <i>Literary Genre(s) of the Book</i>	26
2.2.2 <i>The Languages of the Book (Linguistic Features)</i>	27
2.2.3 <i>Historical Issues Related to the Dating of Daniel</i>	30
2.2.3.1 <i>The Third Year of Jehoiakim and the First Year of Nebuchadnezzar</i>	31
2.2.3.2 <i>Darius the Mede</i>	32
2.2.4 <i>Evidence from the DSS and Intertestamental Books</i>	35
2.2.5 <i>Conclusion: Date, Unity, Purpose and Sitz im Leben of Daniel</i>	38
2.3 <i>EXPLANATORY NOTES ON DANIEL 9 WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO COVENANT TERMINOLOGY</i>	41
2.3.1 <i>Preliminary Issues</i>	41
2.3.1.1 <i>The Place of Daniel 9 in the Book</i>	41
2.3.1.2 <i>Literary Analysis – Issues of Genre</i>	43
2.3.1.3 <i>The Significance of the Prayer in Daniel 9 for the Chapter and the Book as a Whole</i>	44
2.3.2 <i>Daniel’s Prayer (9:1-19)</i>	46
2.3.2.1 <i>Introduction to the Chapter (9:1-2)</i>	46

2.3.2.2	Daniel's Prayer of Repentance (9:3-19)	50
2.3.2.2.1	Introduction to the Prayer (9:3-4a).....	50
2.3.2.2.2	Confession and Affirmation of God's Justice in Judging His People (9:4b-15).....	51
2.3.2.2.3	Daniel's Plea for Mercy (9:16-19)	70
2.3.2.2.4	Summary Remarks on בְּרִית in Daniel's Prayer (9:1-19)	74
2.3.3	The Answer to the Prayer (9:20-27)	75
2.3.3.1	The Angel Gabriel Arrives (9:20)	75
2.3.3.2	Gabriel Speaks to Daniel – Words of Assurance (9:21-22)	78
2.3.3.3	Explanation of Things to Come (9:24-27)	80
2.3.3.3.1	Daniel 9:24.....	81
2.3.3.3.2	Daniel 9:25.....	92
2.3.3.3.3	Daniel 9:26.....	97
2.3.3.3.4	Excursus: קָץ in the MT (with Special Reference to Daniel) and the DSS.....	100
2.3.3.3.5	Daniel 9:27.....	104
2.3.3.4	Summary Remarks on Daniel 9:24-27 and Covenant Terminology in this Section	110
2.4	EXPLANATORY NOTES ON DANIEL 10-12 WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO COVENANT TERMINOLOGY.....	113
2.4.1	Introduction to Daniel 10-12.....	113
2.4.2	The Setting of the Vision/Audition (Daniel 10:1-19)	114
2.4.3	The Angel's Message to Daniel (Daniel 10:20-12:4)	119
2.4.3.1	Introduction to the Message (10:20-11:1).....	120
2.4.3.2	The End of the Persian Empire Is Near (11:2)	121
2.4.3.3	The Short Rule of a Mighty King (11:3-4).....	123
2.4.3.4	Continual Strife between the Kings of the South and the Kings of the North (11:5-20) ..	124
2.4.3.5	The Rise and Demise of the 'Despicable Person' (11:21-45)	130
2.4.3.5.1	The New Ruler's Rise to Power by Stealth – Ignominious Start (11:21-23)	131
2.4.3.5.2	War with the King of the South – Success (11:24-27)	135
2.4.3.5.3	Excursus: The Expressions מוֹרֵעַד and קָץ in Daniel 11-12.....	137
2.4.3.5.4	General Measures against Jewish Religion (11:28).....	138
2.4.3.5.5	War with the King of the South – Failure Due to the Intervention of the 'Kittim' (11:29-30).....	139
2.4.3.5.6	Measures against Religion in General (11:31-38).....	145
2.4.3.5.7	War with Nations, Including the King of the South (11:39-44)	155
2.4.3.5.8	The King's Demise – Ignominious End (11:45)	159
2.4.3.6	Conclusion of the Vision Report: The 'Time of the End' and Daniel's Task (12:1-4)	160
2.4.3.7	Excursus: How Is the Resurrection in Daniel 12:1-3 to Be Understood?	164
2.4.4	Epilogue: The Last Conversation between the Angel and Daniel (12:5-13)	166
2.4.5	Conclusion – The Covenant Theme in Daniel 10-12	171
3	COVENANT IN THE DAMASCUS DOCUMENT (CD), THE COMMUNITY RULE (1QS), THE HYMNS SCROLL (1QH^A) AND THE WAR SCROLL (1QM)	175
3.1	INTRODUCTION.....	175
3.1.1	Recent Developments in DSS Research	175
3.1.2	Use of Terminology	175
3.2	EXPLANATORY NOTES ON SELECTED SECTIONS OF THE DAMASCUS DOCUMENT (CD) WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO COVENANT TERMINOLOGY	177

3.2.1	<i>Introduction to the Damascus Document</i>	177
3.2.1.1	The Nature of the Damascus Document	177
3.2.1.2	The Purpose of the Damascus Document	178
3.2.2	<i>The occurrences of בְּרִית in the Damascus Document</i>	178
3.2.2.1	CD 1:1-2:1.....	178
3.2.2.2	CD 2:2	183
3.2.2.3	Excursus: בּוֹא in Connection with בְּרִית in the HB and in CD	183
3.2.2.4	CD 2:3-4:5.....	188
3.2.2.5	CD 4:6b-19.....	193
3.2.2.6	CD 5-8.....	195
3.2.2.7	CD 15-16.....	202
3.2.2.8	CD 9-11.....	205
3.2.2.9	CD 12-13.....	207
3.2.2.10	CD 19-20.....	210
3.2.2.11	4Q269 9:4-8.....	215
3.2.2.12	Excursus: The Expression 'The New Covenant in the Land of Damascus'	215
3.2.2.12.1	<i>The 'New Covenant' in Jeremiah</i>	216
3.2.2.12.2	<i>The Expression 'In the Land of Damascus'</i>	217
3.2.2.12.3	<i>The Use of the Expression 'The New Covenant in the Land of Damascus' in CD</i>	221
3.2.2.12.4	<i>Concluding Remarks on the Expression 'New Covenant in the Land of Damascus'</i>	229
3.2.3	<i>Concluding Remarks on בְּרִית in CD</i>	233
3.3	<i>EXPLANATORY NOTES ON SELECTED SECTIONS OF THE COMMUNITY RULE (1QS)</i> <i>WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO COVENANT TERMINOLOGY</i>	235
3.3.1	<i>Introduction – Nature and Organization of the Scroll</i>	235
3.3.2	<i>The occurrences of בְּרִית in 1QS</i>	236
3.3.2.1	1QS 1:1-3:12	236
3.3.2.2	1QS 3:13-4:26.....	246
3.3.2.3	1QS 5:1-6:22	248
3.3.2.4	1QS 8:1-9:11.....	260
3.3.2.5	1QS 9:12-11:22	265
3.3.3	<i>Concluding Remarks on בְּרִית in 1QS</i>	265
3.4	<i>EXPLANATORY NOTES ON SELECTED SECTIONS OF THE HYMNS SCROLL (1QH^a) WITH</i> <i>SPECIAL REFERENCE TO COVENANT TERMINOLOGY</i>	267
3.4.1	<i>Introduction: The Nature of the Scroll</i>	267
3.4.2	<i>The occurrences of בְּרִית in 1QH^a</i>	268
3.4.2.1	1QH ^a 4:27	268
3.4.2.2	1QH ^a 6:22	269
3.4.2.3	1QH ^a 7	271
3.4.2.4	1QH ^a 8:16	274
3.4.2.5	Excursus: A Survey of the Use of אִמַּת in 1QH ^a	275
3.4.2.6	1QH ^a 8:17-28	277
3.4.2.7	1QH ^a 10:20-30	278
3.4.2.8	Excursus: טוֹד in the DSS and the MT.....	282
3.4.2.9	1QH ^a 12:5-13:4	283
3.4.2.10	1QH ^a 13:5-19	289

3.4.2.11	1QH ^a 13:20-39	291
3.4.2.12	1QH ^a 15:6-25	294
3.4.2.13	1QH ^a 18:14-19:2	298
3.4.2.14	1QH ^a 21-22	299
3.4.2.15	1QH ^a fr. 4:2-20 (=22:20-39)	302
3.4.2.16	1QH ^a 23.....	303
3.4.2.17	1QH ^a 27.....	303
3.4.3	<i>Concluding Remarks on בְּרִית in 1QH^a</i>	305
3.5	<i>EXPLANATORY NOTES ON SELECTED SECTIONS OF THE WAR SCROLL (1QM) WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO COVENANT TERMINOLOGY</i>	308
3.5.1	<i>The Unique Character, Genre, Unity and Date of the Scroll</i>	308
3.5.1.1	Uniqueness and Genre	308
3.5.1.2	The Unity and Date of the Scroll	309
3.5.2	<i>The occurrences of בְּרִית in 1QM</i>	311
3.5.2.1	1QM 1:1-2.....	311
3.5.2.1.1	<i>The Expression מְרַשְׁעֵי בְרִית in 1QM 1:2</i>	315
3.5.2.1.2	<i>Excursus: Who are the ‘Kittim of Asshur’?</i>	316
3.5.2.2	1QM 1:3-end	320
3.5.2.3	1QM 10.....	323
3.5.2.4	1QM 12:1-5.....	327
3.5.2.5	1QM 13.....	331
3.5.2.6	1QM 14.....	333
3.5.2.7	1QM 15-16.....	335
3.5.2.8	1QM 17.....	336
3.5.2.9	1QM 18.....	342
3.5.3	<i>Concluding Remarks on בְּרִית in 1QM</i>	344
4	<i>Conclusion: Review and Preview</i>	347
4.1	<i>REVIEW – SUMMARY OF FINDINGS</i>	347
4.1.1	<i>Comparison of Important Terminology Used in Connection with בְרִית in Daniel and the DSS</i>	347
4.1.2	<i>What Covenant(s) Do the Authors Mean When They Mention the Word בְרִית?</i>	355
4.2	<i>PREVIEW – WHERE HENCE?</i>	359
	<i>Bibliography</i>	361
A.	<i>Articles and Books</i>	361
B.	<i>Dictionaries, Encyclopaedias, Grammars and Lexicons</i>	382
C.	<i>Bibles</i>	383
D.	<i>Ancient Sources</i>	383

Acknowledgements

I am indebted to many people who made the research in this thesis and its completion possible. First of all, I wish to thank my supervisor, Prof W Boshoff of UNISA, whose encouragement, support and continuous critical-evaluative comments have been invaluable over the years that it took to complete this work. The subject librarian at UNISA, Mrs E Nell, has been a great help and was always willing to assist me in getting access to resources. Without her assistance, much of this research would not have been possible. To my colleagues at Harare Theological College (HTC) I also owe a great debt of gratitude. They often provided the sounding board that I needed to check out ideas. Their prayers and continuous support throughout the writing process have been much appreciated. Mrs A Podmore, the HTC librarian, not only helped with a number of resources but also kindly proofread part of the finished document. Two other people also helped proofread the manuscript, namely Pastor J Bell of Central Baptist Church, Harare, and my husband, Mr G Linington. I am grateful for their suggestions at language improvement, but all errors remain my responsibility. Most important in the last stages of this research was the principal of HTC, Mr S Doyle, who reduced my teaching load during 2014. Having been able to work from home for most of the last year certainly enabled me to complete this work in good time.

Moreover, I wish to thank the members of my family and church family, especially my in-laws, for their continued support and prayers. The kind help by family members in South Africa enabled me to get a much needed resource which was not available elsewhere. With their continued inquiries about my progress and their dedicated prayers the friends in my home Bible study group and my parents and brother in Germany challenged me to keep going. Most of all my husband, Mr G Linington, exercised patience and endurance with a sometimes less than amiable researcher in the house. For his continued love, support, encouragement and coaxing I am very grateful. To him and to my mother, Mrs I Sinning, I dedicate this thesis.

Finally, without the enabling grace of God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, none of this work would have been possible.

Declaration

I declare that *Covenant (בְּרִית) in Daniel and the Dead Sea Scrolls: An exposition of Daniel 9-12 and Selected Sections of the Damascus Document (CD), Community Rule (IQS), Hymns Scroll (IQH^a) and War Scroll (IQM)* is my own work and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

I further declare that I have not previously submitted this work, or part of it, for examination at UNISA for another qualification or at any other higher education institution.

Signature:

Silvia Linington

Date:

Summary

The following thesis comprises a systematic, synchronic study of the term בְּרִית (*b^erît*, covenant) in the book of Daniel, the Damascus Document, the Community Rule (*Serekh-ha-Yahad*), the Hymn Scroll (*Hodayot*) and the War Scroll (*Milhamah*). The basic text used for Daniel is the BHS, and for the Dead Sea Scrolls the Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library, supplemented by other editions.

Apart from an introduction (chapter 1), the work is divided into two sections. The second chapter begins with a discussion of some introductory matters, such as the dating and purpose of the book of Daniel. The remainder of the chapter comprises two subsections, consisting firstly of an exegesis of Daniel 9 and secondly an exposition of Daniel 10-12 with particular reference to covenant terminology. The prayer in Daniel 9 is given much space since it is replete with covenant language, though the word בְּרִית only occurs at Daniel 9:4. The main focus of the second subsection is the vision report in Daniel 11, with particular emphasis on Daniel 11:20-45 where the word בְּרִית occurs.

The third chapter contains four subsections, each giving an exegesis of those parts of the Damascus Document, Community Rule, Hymn Scroll and War Scroll where the term בְּרִית occurs. Each subsection is preceded by a brief introduction to the scroll concerned, looking at such issues as the provenance and dating of the scroll without going into too much detail, and followed by a conclusion, summarising the findings in each section. While such issues as the nature of the community represented by each scroll are mentioned where appropriate, they do not form a major emphasis in this study.

Throughout, particular prominence is given to specific terminology used in order to determine the authors' theological emphases. A few terms that are related to בְּרִית, 'covenant', such as חֶסֶד (*hesed* 'mercy, lovingkindness'), אֶהָב (*'āhāb*; [covenant] love), אָלָה (*'ālāh*; 'curse, oath'), are also included in this study at the relevant places.

The conclusion (chapter 4) draws together the findings of all sections and seeks to compare the terminology used in Daniel with that of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Key Words

Covenant, *b^erît*, Daniel, Daniel 9, Daniel 10-12, Damascus Document, CD, Community Rule, Manual of Discipline, *Serekh-ha-Yahad*, 1QS, Hymn Scroll, *Hodayot*, 1QH, War Scroll, *Milhamah*, 1QM.

Abbreviations

A. Journals, Books, Electronic Resources & Publishers

<i>AJSL</i>	<i>The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures</i>
<i>ANE</i>	<i>Ancient Near East</i>
<i>AS</i>	<i>Aramaic Studies</i>
<i>AUSS</i>	<i>Andrews University Seminary Studies</i>
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research</i>
<i>BDB</i>	<i>Enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon</i>
<i>BHS</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia 1996</i>
<i>BibSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i>
<i>BR</i>	<i>Biblical Research</i>
<i>BRev</i>	<i>Bible Review</i>
<i>BST</i>	<i>The Bible Speaks Today</i>
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>CDCH</i>	<i>The Concise Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i>
<i>CTJ</i>	<i>Calvin Theological Journal</i>
<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
<i>DSS</i>	<i>Dead Sea Scrolls</i>
<i>DSSEL</i>	<i>Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library</i>
<i>DSSSE</i>	<i>Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition (electronic version)</i>
<i>ESV</i>	<i>English Standard Version</i>
<i>Gesenius</i>	<i>Gesenius' Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures, electronic version</i>
<i>GVRL</i>	<i>Gale Virtual Reference Library</i>
<i>HALOT</i>	<i>A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament (electronic version).</i>
<i>HThR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
<i>IEJ</i>	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
<i>IVP</i>	<i>Inter-Varsity Press</i>
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JATS</i>	<i>Journal of the Adventist Theological Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal for Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JHS</i>	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal for Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
<i>JSJS</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement Series</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JSOTS</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series</i>
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>MT</i>	<i>Masoretic Text</i>
<i>NASB</i>	<i>New American Standard Bible (1995 updated version)</i>
<i>NICOT</i>	<i>New International Commentary on the Old Testament</i>
<i>NIDOTTE</i>	<i>New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, 5 vols.</i>
<i>NIV</i>	<i>New International Version</i>
<i>NIVAC</i>	<i>NIV Application Commentary</i>
<i>NJB</i>	<i>New Jerusalem Bible</i>
<i>NKJV</i>	<i>New King James Version</i>
<i>NLT</i>	<i>New Living Translation</i>
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>OG</i>	<i>Old Greek Translation of Daniel</i>
<i>OT</i>	<i>Old Testament</i>

<i>OTE</i>	<i>Old Testament Essays</i>
<i>PEQ</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
<i>RQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>RSV</i>	<i>Revised Standard Version</i>
<i>StTh</i>	<i>Studia Theologica</i>
<i>Swete</i>	<i>The Lexham Greek-English Interlinear Septuagint: H.B. Swete Edition</i>
<i>TB</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
<i>TDOT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament (Botterweck & Ringgren), 15 vols.</i>
<i>TLOT</i>	<i>Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament</i>
<i>TLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
<i>TMSJ</i>	<i>Master's Seminary Journal</i>
<i>TOTC</i>	<i>Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries</i>
<i>TWOT</i>	<i>Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament (electronic version)</i>
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>VTS</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum Supplements</i>
<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZTK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

B. Biblical Books, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha and Dead Sea Scrolls (unless where a quotation uses different abbreviations)

<i>Gn</i>	<i>Genesis</i>
<i>Ex</i>	<i>Exodus</i>
<i>Lv</i>	<i>Leviticus</i>
<i>Nu</i>	<i>Numbers</i>
<i>Dt</i>	<i>Deuteronomy</i>
<i>Josh</i>	<i>Joshua</i>
<i>Jdg</i>	<i>Judges</i>
<i>Sm</i>	<i>Samuel</i>
<i>Ki</i>	<i>Kings</i>
<i>Chr</i>	<i>Chronicles</i>
<i>Ezr</i>	<i>Ezra</i>
<i>Neh</i>	<i>Nehemiah</i>
<i>Est</i>	<i>Ester</i>
<i>Ps</i>	<i>Psalms</i>
<i>Pr</i>	<i>Proverbs</i>
<i>SS</i>	<i>Song of Songs</i>
<i>Is</i>	<i>Isaiah</i>
<i>Jr</i>	<i>Jeremiah</i>
<i>Lam</i>	<i>Lamentations</i>
<i>Ezk</i>	<i>Ezekiel</i>
<i>Dan</i>	<i>Daniel (only in quotations)</i>
<i>Dn</i>	<i>Daniel</i>
<i>Hs</i>	<i>Hosea</i>
<i>Am</i>	<i>Amos</i>
<i>Mic</i>	<i>Micah</i>
<i>Nah</i>	<i>Nahum</i>
<i>Hb</i>	<i>Habakkuk</i>
<i>Zeph</i>	<i>Zephaniah</i>
<i>Zech</i>	<i>Zechariah</i>
<i>Mal</i>	<i>Malachi</i>
<i>Macc</i>	<i>Maccabees</i>
<i>Mt</i>	<i>Matthew</i>

<i>Mk</i>	<i>Mark</i>
<i>Lk</i>	<i>Luke</i>
<i>Jn</i>	<i>John</i>
<i>Ac</i>	<i>Acts</i>
<i>Ro</i>	<i>Romans</i>
<i>Cor</i>	<i>Corinthians</i>
<i>Gal</i>	<i>Galatians</i>
<i>Eph</i>	<i>Ephesians</i>
<i>Phil</i>	<i>Philippians</i>
<i>Col</i>	<i>Colossians</i>
<i>Hbr</i>	<i>Hebrews</i>
<i>Js</i>	<i>James</i>
<i>Pt</i>	<i>Peter</i>
<i>Rev</i>	<i>Revelation</i>
<i>En</i>	<i>Enoch</i>
<i>Apoc Bar</i>	<i>Apocalypse of Baruch</i>
<i>Ant</i>	<i>Antiquities</i>
<i>1QH</i>	<i>Hymn Scroll, Hodayot from Cave 1</i>
<i>1QIs^a</i>	<i>Isaiah Scroll from Cave 1</i>
<i>1QM</i>	<i>War Scroll, Milhamah from Cave 1</i>
<i>1QpHab</i>	<i>Pesher Habakkuk from Cave 1</i>
<i>1QS</i>	<i>Rule of the Community, Serekh-ha-Yahad from Cave 1</i>
<i>4QDibHam</i>	<i>Words of the Luminaries^a from Cave 4</i>
<i>4QMMT</i>	<i>Halakhic Letter from Cave 4</i>
<i>4QpIs</i>	<i>Pesher Isaiah from Cave 4</i>
<i>4QpNah</i>	<i>Pesher Nahum from Cave 4</i>
<i>4QpPs</i>	<i>Pesher on Psalms from Cave 4</i>
<i>CD</i>	<i>Damascus Document</i>
<i>D</i>	<i>Damascus Document including fragments from Qumran caves</i>
<i>Jub</i>	<i>Jubilees</i>
<i>S</i>	<i>Rule of the Community including fragments from other caves</i>

C. Grammatical and General Abbreviations

$\sqrt{\quad}$	<i>root</i>
<i>ANE</i>	<i>Ancient Near East</i>
<i>BCE</i>	<i>Before the Christian Era</i>
<i>CE</i>	<i>Christian Era</i>
<i>chap(s)</i>	<i>chapter(s)</i>
<i>ch(s)</i>	<i>chapter(s)</i>
<i>cons</i>	<i>waw-consecutive</i>
<i>cp</i>	<i>common plural</i>
<i>cs</i>	<i>common singular</i>
<i>def art</i>	<i>definite article</i>
<i>Eng</i>	<i>English</i>
<i>fs</i>	<i>feminine singular</i>
<i>HB</i>	<i>Hebrew Bible</i>
<i>Hiph</i>	<i>Hiphil</i>
<i>Hip</i>	<i>Hithpael</i>
<i>Hoph</i>	<i>Hophal</i>
<i>impf</i>	<i>imperfect</i>
<i>impt</i>	<i>imperative</i>
<i>inf cons</i>	<i>infinitive construct</i>
<i>mp</i>	<i>masculine plural</i>
<i>ms</i>	<i>masculine singular</i>
<i>mss</i>	<i>(Hebrew) manuscripts</i>
<i>MT</i>	<i>Masoretic Text</i>

<i>n</i>	<i>Noun</i>
<i>Niph</i>	<i>Niphal</i>
<i>OG</i>	<i>Old Greek Translation of Daniel</i>
<i>OT</i>	<i>Old Testament</i>
<i>pf</i>	<i>perfect</i>
<i>Pi</i>	<i>Piel</i>
<i>pt</i>	<i>Participle</i>

Note:

All quotations in Hebrew come from the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia: With Westminster Hebrew Morphology*. 1996, ©1925; morphology ©1991. (Electronic Version. Logos Library System). Stuttgart/Glenside PA: German Bible Society/Westminster Seminary. In shorter quotations, the accent marks have been removed. All word studies are based on this electronic edition.

Unless noted otherwise, all quotations and translations from the Dead Sea Scrolls are from Tov, E. (ed.). 2006. *Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library*. (Version 7.0.24; Revised ed.). Leiden/Boston: Brill.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and Rationale for this Research

Part of my Master's studies included a detailed investigation of the occurrences of the word ברית, 'covenant,' in the Old Testament (OT). The main aim was to ascertain the context and meaning of the word and to suggest translation equivalents in each case. I believed that a similar systematic study on at least some of the Dead Sea Scrolls (in particular those where much material had been preserved) would result in some interesting comparative material, especially since their idea of covenant seemed to be both similar and different from that found in the OT. Furthermore, one of the biblical books that has always held a fascination for me is Daniel. Although the word 'covenant' only occurs seven times in the book, the usual assumption that it is a late work composed close to the time when the DSS were composed makes it a good candidate for investigation together with them. Initially I wanted to trace the covenant theme throughout the book of Daniel, but space restrictions have made it necessary to concentrate on those sections where the word ברית actually occurs, i.e. the last two visions in Daniel 9 and 10-12. The same consideration led to the restriction of the DSS material: only the *Damascus Document* and the Cave 1 material of the Community Rule (*Serekh-ha-Yahad*), the Hymn Scroll (*Hodayot*) and the War Scroll (*Milhamah*) can be included in the present study, with only occasional references to fragments from other caves where appropriate.

1.2 Research Problem(s) and Objectives

When I began this research in 2005, the book of Daniel had been researched quite extensively in the previous two decades (cf. e.g. the collections of essays in van der Woude, ed. 1993; Collins & Flint (eds.). 2001, vols. 1 & 2; and the commentaries by Collins 1993; Lucas 2002; Seow 2003; etc.), including comparisons with the Dead Sea Scrolls materials (e.g. Mertens 1971), but as far as I was aware, the covenant theme had not featured greatly in these studies. There had been some studies on the covenant concept in the Dead Sea Scrolls (e.g. the articles in Porter & de Roo 2003), but these also were not exhaustive and invited further scrutiny. A sentence that inspired me from the early days of my research was the remark by Porter and de Roo (2003:3) that their collection of essays should be an impetus 'to generate further research into the concept of covenant in the Second Temple period.' This was exactly what I hoped to do.

In the systematic study of the occurrences of a word in a group of texts a number of issues arise. The book of Daniel for example bristles with problems (such as dating, unity) that will influence one's exegesis and that therefore need to be addressed. This will be done in the introductory section of the second chapter of this thesis. There is an almost universal agreement that Daniel was at least finally edited in the second century BC (more precisely between about 167 and 164 BCE), if not composed then. However, there are indications that at least part of the book, and perhaps more than most scholars would admit, may originate far earlier. In the introduction to the chapter on Daniel, some of these problems will be discussed, but occasional references to dating issues will also be mentioned in the exegetical sections on Daniel 9-12. My own church background is conservative and I believe in the divine inspiration of the Scriptures. Therefore I question some of the hypotheses among scholars regarding the (late) date and unity (or lack of it) of Daniel. I shall take a fresh look at some of the arguments concerning the dating of the book, including a consideration of some DSS material that has to my knowledge not been used to discuss the dating of Daniel before.

The major part of the study will consider how far the covenant and a few selected related themes feature in Daniel and the selected DSS (CD, 1QS, 1QH^a, 1QM). Of particular interest is the investigation of the use of specific terminology in connection with covenant, since this gives clues concerning the author's or authors' theology. For example, what words are used in connection with covenant (such as בוא, 'enter'; קום, 'establish'; etc.)? What is the significance of the use of the word עבר ('*ābar*) to express the idea of 'entering' into the covenant in 1QS (in most of the OT and other DSS the word means 'transgress' when used with regard to the covenant, but in 1QS it has taken on the meaning 'to enter', just as in Deuteronomy 29, the only covenant context in the Old Testament where it does not mean 'transgress')?

Apart from trying to establish the meaning of the word ברית where it is used explicitly, it is also important to decide which covenant is in fact being referred to: that with the patriarchs, the covenant at Sinai, with the priesthood, with David, the (biblical) new covenant or another covenant not mentioned in the Bible. What in fact does it mean to 'be in covenant' for the writers of Daniel, CD, 1QS, 1QH and 1QM? Is there a development in the concept of covenant from Daniel to the Dead Sea Scrolls material, and what is the significance of this development or lack thereof?

1.3 Research Design and Methodology

This work involves a detailed exegesis and inductive study of the texts of Daniel 9-12 and those sections in CD, 1QS, 1QM and 1QH^a where the word *בְּרִית* appears. A few related terms (such as ‘mercy,’ ‘curse’) will be considered in excursuses or in the course of the exegesis of particular scriptures/lines. In other words, apart from considering grammatical and contextual issues, this presentation will include a number of lexical studies.

For the book of Daniel, the basic text is the Masoretic Text (MT) as it appears in the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS). The Greek additions will not be included, and the Septuagint (LXX) or Old Greek (OG) only referred to where necessary (this is partly because I follow the Protestant tradition and partly because I only have a rudimentary knowledge of Greek). Although a number of Bible translations (e.g. NASB, NIV, ESV, etc.) and translations of the DSS (e.g. DSSEL, DSSSE, Vermez, García Martínez) will be quoted, I will mostly provide my own translations.

The first major part of the thesis, chapter 2, consists of a detailed exegesis of the last two visions of Daniel (chapters 9 and 10-12) where the word ‘covenant’ explicitly occurs, including an investigation of the structure of these chapters and their purpose in the book in general. The prayer in Daniel 9 is very important, since its use of covenant language is often underestimated in commentaries. The significance of the chapter for the theology of the book as a whole and the visions in particular will also be investigated, especially as Daniel 9 is at the centre of the Hebrew visions (chapters 8-12).

The second major part of the thesis, i.e. chapter 3, comprises an exposition of those sections in the Damascus Document (CD), the Community Rule (1QS), the Hodayot (1QH^a) and the War Scroll (1QM) which mention the word *בְּרִית* explicitly (comparison with material from cave 4 will only be conducted at a few relevant places). The choice of these documents rather than others, apart from space restrictions, is partly because they are the best preserved among the scrolls, but also because in these documents the word ‘covenant’ appears most often and therefore the concept seems to be of greater significance than in other scrolls. Moreover, at least the first column of 1QM is closely related to the book of Daniel. Though strictly speaking CD is not part of the DSS, it has been included since a number of cave 4, 5 and 6 fragments have come to light that clearly indicate that the work was known among those who hid the scrolls in antiquity. In fact, the scroll is usually included in editions and translations of the DSS.

The present work differs from other studies of *בְּרִית* in the DSS in a number of ways, and I believe that it adds to current research by looking at the terminology from a

slightly different perspective. As noted, a detailed and systematic study and exegesis of all occurrences of the word *בְּרִית* in CD, 1QS, 1QH^a and 1QM (including fragments from other caves where relevant) will be conducted, including the contexts where the word occurs and the particular terminology used by the writers/redactors of these works. This is something that does not appear in this way in the works consulted, though that does not necessarily mean it has never been done before.

Secondly, the study will generally be performed synchronically, i.e. redaction-critical issues will only be mentioned if it is absolutely essential for establishing the sense of a particular passage. A number of scholars have engaged in diachronic study,¹ and their conclusions will be critically assessed where appropriate. I believe that synchronic study will add a different dimension to the exegesis of these documents, since it will look at the documents as we have them,² rather than at purported previous forms that are hypothetical in nature. Each edition that is available to us was put together for a particular audience, and it is the significance for that audience that has to be uncovered before conclusions may be drawn regarding the redaction critical history of the text.

Thirdly, I propose to compare and contrast the use of the word *בְּרִית* and other related terms in the DSS with that in the book of Daniel in a more systematic and detailed manner than has been seen in the works consulted. The significance of Daniel at Qumran is well-documented, and I hope to add my own conclusions to the current research. This will be the emphasis in the concluding chapter.

1.4 Brief Survey of Some of the Literature Used

The bibliography at the end of this thesis gives ample testimony to the many sources to which I am indebted and which have influenced my thinking and argument in this thesis. It is impossible to comment on all the sources, or even all the major ones, but this part of the chapter will briefly highlight some of the texts that have been particularly inspiring, challenging or influential during my study.

For the work on Daniel, John Collins' commentary (1993), as well as those of Baldwin (1978), Goldingay (1991), Longman (1999), Lucas (2002) and Steinmann (2008), among many others, have been invaluable resources to which I owe many insights.

¹ Cf. Hultgren (2007); Murphy-O'Connor (1970-72); Davies (1982a).

² Cf. Charlesworth (1997:200-201) who notes that when studying texts '[w]e must see what is before us, a particular text, and not simply understand it as a mirror image of another text or family of texts. *Its own unique voice must be heard...*' (italics added).

Baldwin, Longman and Steinmann are more conservative than the others, especially where the dating of Daniel is concerned, and I have gained many spiritual insights from them. Collins, Goldingay and Lucas each have in their own way challenged my thinking on the dating issue, though I still prefer a conservative viewpoint on the matter. Their insights into the texts have also been greatly beneficial.

Because of its different approach to the text, Wildgruber's (2013) study on Daniel 10-12 has been particularly inspiring for that section. Wildgruber engages in what she calls 'close reading.' She looks at the Hebrew text itself, providing her own translation and thorough grammatical analyses, and critically evaluates historical identifications usually associated especially with Daniel 11. Most illuminating are her studies of a number of semantic fields (such as 'time' and 'religion'). I believe a similar approach conducted on the other chapters of Daniel would yield promising results.

For the study on the DSS Hultgren's (2007) book *From Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community* was vitally important. Though at first it appeared that this book would render my own research redundant (I only became aware of it a few years after I had embarked on my research), this is in fact not the case. Hultgren's purpose is to 'understand the covenantal theology (or theologies) contained in the Dead Sea Scrolls ... as well as the history and covenantal polity (or polities) of the people that stand behind them' (Hultgren 2007:1). My purpose is far more modest, and my approach to the texts is quite different from Hultgren's. For example, I am not focussing on the history of the textual transmission of the documents in question, but simply take the texts as they are, believing that in the state they were found they made sense at least to the writers/editors/redactors and their original audience(s), whoever they may have been. I simply wish to systematically examine the contexts where the word בריתה appears in Daniel and the DSS and find connections between these texts. While an understanding of the covenant theology of the texts is also an important part of my thesis, I am less concerned with 'the history and ... polity' of the sectarians, though of course these topics feature as well. Perhaps it is best to say that I took to heart Hultgren's (2007:4) remark that his work should 'serve as a stimulus to further work on the part of other scholars.'

Another work that I found refreshing because of its different stance is Heger's (2012) book *Challenges to Conventional Opinions on Qumran and Enoch Issues*. His critique of the widely accepted view that the DSS sectarians held to a dualistic worldview that probably derived from Persian religion is very interesting and in my opinion quite convincing (see below), and I believe his arguments are worthy of further scrutiny.

Grossman (2002) uses an approach to the reading of the Damascus Document that may perhaps also be useful for the study of the other scrolls and Daniel, though I do not agree with her in every aspect. While she makes a good point by suggesting that ‘textual meaning ... is fundamentally dynamic,’ and ‘susceptible to different interpretations’ (Grossman 2002:24), both by the original author and readers, it is in my opinion nonetheless also true that each text also had an original meaning intended by the original author(s). And even though readers will provide ‘interpretations of “the meaning” of a text that serve their own immediate and pressing concerns at different moments in the history of the text’ (Grossman 2002:24), this does not mean that it is not useful to find out the original intended meaning as well, especially where the biblical texts are concerned.³ If the Bible is God’s revealed word to us, then the original meaning is important as it represents God’s intention for his people (though he used human authors to pass it on). Obviously each generation of readers will apply a text differently to their situation, but I wonder whether this should be called ‘interpretation of the meaning’ of a text. And can an interpretation that is diametrically opposed to the original intention of an author still be called ‘meaning’? That would imply that one can read anything one wants into a text, which is no longer exegesis or interpretation but eisegesis. Therefore, while Grossman puts forward an interesting and novel approach to the reading of a text which may yield promising results both for other DSS and biblical texts, it is to be used with caution.

Wacholder’s (2007) translation and commentary on the New Damascus Document, or Midrash on the Eschatological Torah (MTA, מדרש התורה האחרון) as he calls it, is a combination of CD as well as all the Qumran fragments into a unified whole. He believes that the document was essentially written by one author (Wacholder 2007:9), before the Maccabean wars (in the third century BCE; Wacholder 2007:3), and that most of the historical references, including that of a migration to Damascus, refer to the future (Wacholder 2007:20). While I generally do not agree with his futuristic interpretation of the text and one may argue about the validity of some of his reconstructions, Wacholder has provided many important insights and suggestions that I was able to utilize.

For the study of 1QS I found Schofield’s (2009) chapter on variant readings among the S manuscripts in her book *From Qumran to the Yahad* a valuable resource. A number of articles on the question of the significance of the council of fifteen members in 1QS 8

³ What is in fact significant is that while texts such as the Damascus Document and other DSS have come down to us in what appears to be different recensions and editions, this is only true for the biblical texts to a limited extent. Though there were different textual traditions of the OT among the DSS, spurring discussions regarding the interpretation of this evidence, e.g. by Albright (1955:27-33), Cross (1964:281-299; 1966:81-95) and Tov (1982:11-17), by the time of the Bar Kochba revolt (132-135 CE) a consensus had been reached about the biblical texts that meant that henceforth only MT-like texts were transmitted (cf. Wegner 1999:164-169).

also provided much food for thought (cf. e.g. Knibb 1987; Berg 2007; Metso 1997 & 1998). Because of his focus on biblical parallels, Holm-Nielsen's (1960) work on the *Hodayot* was the most useful to me, but equally significant was Hughes' (2006) study on *Scriptural Allusions in the Hodayot* and the works by Newsom (2001, 2004, 2012). The new edition of the *Hodayot* by Schuller & Newsom (2012) was most helpful for comparisons with editions of earlier scholars (Mansoor 1961; Holm-Nielsen 1960; DSSEL 2006; etc.). Moreover, this work contains a useful conversion table for converting line numbers from Sukenik's (1954/55) initial edition (and those based on it, such as Holm-Nielsen 1960 and Mansoor 1961) to later ones (including DSSEL and Schuller & Newsom 2012). For the War Scroll I found Schultz's (2009) book *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered* a most comprehensive work. I also relied much on the translations and comments on 1QM by Yadin (1962), Davies (1977) and Duhaime (1995), among others.

2 Covenant in the Book of Daniel

2.1 Introduction

In the book of Daniel the actual word *בְּרִית* occurs only seven times, namely at 9:4, 27; 11:22, 28, 30 (2x), 32. Except for Daniel 9:4, all other occurrences appear in apocalyptic visions (chapter 11) or explanations (9:27). However, although the word does not occur very often in this book, the theme is nevertheless present in other chapters as well, but the limited scope of this work prevents me from looking at Daniel 1-8 where the word ‘covenant’ does not appear. This chapter will provide an exegesis of Daniel 9 and 10-12 with particular reference to those sections where the word *בְּרִית* is actually mentioned, but before embarking on an exposition of these chapters, some introductory matters, especially the dating and unity of the book, will have to be considered.

2.2 Some Remarks on the Genre(s), Languages, Dating, Unity and Purpose of the Book of Daniel

Explicit date references are found in Daniel 1:1-2 (Nebuchadnezzar’s accession year, when Daniel and his friends were deported to Babylon); Daniel 2:1 (Nebuchadnezzar’s second year); Daniel 7:1 (the first year of Belshazzar, Nabonidus’ son and regent); Daniel 8:1 (Belshazzar’s third year); Daniel 9:1-2 (the first year of Darius the Mede) and Daniel 10:1 (the third year of Cyrus the Persian). It is interesting that there is an emphasis on the Babylonian Empire: chapters 1 to 5 are set during that time, and so are chapters 7 and 8, though the visions recorded in these chapters focus more on the later Greek empire. Daniel 9, like Daniel 6, is set in the first year of the reign of ‘Darius the Mede’, or, more significantly, soon after the fall of the Babylonian empire (cf. Davis 2013:114; see below on Darius the Mede). Only chapters 10-12 are set during the Persian Empire, but look forward to the Greek Empire, as do chapters 7-9. If this internal evidence of the book is taken seriously, that would mean that Daniel ministered for about 70 years and must have been well into his eighties when the book closes.

Conservative scholars have always taken these date references seriously and literally, and adhere to an early, usually sixth century, dating of the book. They believe that Daniel is a real person who, as stated in the book, lived in sixth-century BCE Babylonia as one of the Jewish exiles who served the kings first at the Babylonian, and then at the Persian court. It was his exploits and visions which are described in chapters 1-6 and 7-12 respectively, and he is often, though not always, considered the author of the book as a

whole. However, most modern scholars take the view that these date references as well as the figure of Daniel (i.e. the person who had the visions) are fictional and that the book is to be dated in the second century BCE; more precisely, after the religious persecution of Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes had started, but before his death (ca. 164 BCE), since Daniel 11:40-45 predicts events that are not compatible with any known historical facts from Antiochus' reign. It is impossible in the context of the present study to consider all the relevant issues regarding the dating of Daniel. In the following paragraphs I will therefore outline only some of the more significant issues involved in the dating of the book.⁴

2.2.1 Literary Genre(s) of the Book

Though Daniel is usually designated apocalyptic,⁵ the book is in many ways an exception to this genre (Baldwin 1978:46), especially when the whole book is considered⁶ and not just chapters 7-12. Baldwin's (1978:13) suggestion that Daniel is basically eschatological, and, like the early chapters of Genesis, also universal in outlook has much to commend it. But Daniel also stands in continuity with the law and the prophets, especially their 'presupposition that the God who initiated human life controls history and will bring it to its appointed goal' (Baldwin 1978:13). Like the prophets, Daniel looks forward toward the goal of history, but unlike the prophets this goal in Daniel is not limited to something within the 'history of the promises to Israel' but looks forward to the end of time 'and the completion of God's purpose for the world He created' (Baldwin 1978:14).

Daniel 10-12 fits well into the general definition of 'an apocalypse with a review of history' (Lucas 2002:310).⁷ However, if one of the main features of such an apocalypse is the reference to a personal afterlife, at least chapters 7-9 'are not typical apocalypses, though they have much in common with them in their form ... and content' (Lucas

⁴ An exceptionally detailed discussion of many of these issues can be found in Collins (1993:1-123), but cf. also introductions in Redditt (1999:1-39); Anderson (1984:xiii-xvii); Goldingay (1991:xxv-xl & 320-334); and from a more conservative perspective e.g. Steinmann (2008:1-19); Baldwin (1978:13-72).

⁵ The classic definition of 'apocalypse' is found in Collins (1979a:9; 1979b:22): "'Apocalypse" is a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.' More precisely, Collins (1979a:13; 1979b:22) locates Daniel 7-12 within the narrower limits of 'apocalypses with no otherworldly journey.' Among its major features he lists ex-eventu prophecy (Collins 1979a:16); a 'future judgment in which the wicked are punished and the good rewarded' (Collins 1979b:25); an 'individual afterlife' (Collins 1979b:25); and pseudonymity (Collins 1979b:28). Dimant (1994:179) defines apocalyptic against other genres such as testaments and *haggadas* among the DSS. She observes that '[a]n *apocalypse* is a discourse in the first person relating divine revelation granted to a wise seer and interpreted through divine wisdom. Such a revelation often concerns history and is usually set in a third person narrative framework that identifies the speaker, normally a biblical sage, and determines the circumstances of the speech' (Dimant 1994:179; italics original). She then notes that the narrative framework is 'the main vehicle for establishing the pseudepigraphic framework' (Dimant 1994:179).

⁶ Chapters 1-6 are often labelled 'court tales' and considered legends (cf. Collins 1993:1).

⁷ Dimant (1994:181) notes that all the early apocalypses contain only dream visions rather than otherworldly journeys, 'since dream visions are the proper medium of communication with the heavenly world.'

2002:310). Another feature that is considered vital in apocalypses is the pseudonymity of its author, who usually adopts the name of an ancient sage (Collins 1979b:28; Dimant 1994:179). However, here Daniel is also different, since the name Daniel does not refer to any known figure from Israel's *ancient* history.⁸ On the contrary, as Plöger (1965:29) points out, the figure in the book 'belongs not to the ancient past, but to [present] history; more exactly, the exilic time between kings Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus' (my translation).

It is perhaps also significant that most of the apocalypses that have been found among the DSS are written in Aramaic rather than Hebrew (Dimant 1994:179). In Daniel of course the opposite is the case: three of the four apocalyptic chapters are written in Hebrew. Maybe it was this fact that led to the inclusion of Daniel into the canon rather than any of the other apocalypses.

Some scholars, e.g. Lucas (2002:311), suggest that Daniel has affinities with Babylonian mantic wisdom. If this is the case, it is possible that the book 'is one of the earliest examples of the apocalyptic genre' and therefore 'it is not surprising that it does not exactly fit the later, developed form of the genre' (Lucas 2002:311). However, the writer(s) of Daniel 7-12 is a Jew, and it seems more likely that he would depend on Jewish traditions rather than on extrabiblical ones, though these may have had some influence on him. Therefore, it is equally significant to realise Daniel's reliance on prophetic and wisdom literature. For example, some of the visions are clearly dependent on earlier prophets such as Ezekiel (cf. e.g. Ezk 1-3 with Dn 7) and Jeremiah (cf. Jr 29 with Dn 9), and wisdom literature (cf. the use of terms such as בִּינָה that are particularly important in wisdom literature). Thus, though Daniel 7-12 may be considered partly apocalyptic due to the subject matter treated, they are not apocalypses in the strict sense of the word but include other literary genres as well.

2.2.2 The Languages of the Book (Linguistic Features)

Daniel is written in Hebrew (1:1-2:4a and 8:1-12:13) and Aramaic (2:4b-7:28). Both changes are ancient since they are attested in the DSS (see 1Q71 2:3-4 for Dn 2:4; 4Q112 fr. 14 for Dn 7-8). It is obvious that the use of two different languages is only explicable in

⁸ The name occurs in Ezekiel 14:14, 20 and 28:3, but the spelling there is defective, דַּנְיָאֵל, rather than דַּנְיָאֵל, as in Daniel. Some scholars (e.g. Day 1980:174) argue that Ezekiel's Daniel is to be identified with the figure of the same name found in the Aqhat epic of Ugarit, but this is not universally accepted (Dressler 1979:160-161 concludes he is not, and I would agree with him). It is beyond the scope of this work to go into the details of the pro's and con's for and against the identification of Ezekiel's Daniel with the Daniel in our book. I personally find Block's (1997:447-450) argument for such an identification convincing, but many scholars disagree. For a more detailed study of the issues concerned see Day (1980).

an environment where both languages are familiar to the intended audience (and, for that matter, the writer; cf. Kautzsch & Brown 1884:99-100). However, to date no completely satisfactory explanation for the change in languages exists, though a number of suggestions have been made.⁹ Many scholars therefore argue for a rather complicated compilation history. It is suggested that Aramaic and Hebrew sources were incorporated and edited into the book we have today. For example, van der Woude (1993a) suggests that Daniel 1:1-2:4 was written by Maccabean authors (originally in Aramaic and later translated into Hebrew, after chs. 8-12 had been composed) to authenticate chapters 8-12 and give the book more authority, whereas chapter 7 consisted of a few Aramaic verses which the writer of chapters 8-12 embellished in the same language. Collins (1993:24) argues similarly that the tales of chapters 2-6 probably existed as a separate collection, for which an introduction was written (ch. 1, originally in Aramaic and later translated). In his view, chapter 7 was probably composed before the other visions and even ‘come[s] from a different hand, though from the same circles’ (Collins 1993:24). Collins (1993:24) explains the language change with the ‘enthusiasm of the Maccabean period.’ However, this does not seem to be a satisfactory explanation either.

Portier-Young’s (2010:98) suggestion that the writer(s) of Daniel deliberately wrote first in Hebrew, then switched to Aramaic and later back to Hebrew ‘to move [the book’s] audience to a recognition of a new context in which the claims of empire had dissolved and claims of covenant alone remained’ has much to commend it. Taking into account recent research in socio-linguistics which emphasises that in multi-lingual environments people usually switch languages deliberately (Portier-Young 2010:99) and for various reasons,¹⁰ she argues that the audience of Daniel was invited ‘to find their place

⁹ Plöger (1965:27) suggests that Aramaic is symbolic of the new language Daniel had to learn, and this section thus related to things Babylonian, whereas the Hebrew section (esp. chs. 8-12) deals more with Jewish/Hebrew matters (cf. Archer 1985). Others argue that Hebrew was more intended for ‘a learned circle of readers’ (Collins 1993:12; cf. Kautzsch & Brown 1884:100; Hebbard 2009:21-24, esp. p. 22). Driver (1922:514) admits that the change in language is difficult to explain but suggests that the writer simply changed to Aramaic at 2:4 and continued till the end of chapter 7 ‘because he supposed it to be the language spoken by the “Chaldeans”’ and ‘because he was more at home in it than in Hebrew’, but then changed to ‘the language of the prophets’ in the last five chapters. Lucas (2000:75) proposes that ‘[c]oncern for secrecy might provide an explanation of the bilingual character of Daniel,’ but he also points out the fact that the split of languages does not coincide with the division between stories and visions. This makes the argument somewhat less likely. Snell (1980:43) suggests that Daniel may be imitating Ezra, and that the reason for Aramaic in both books ‘is to lend authenticity to reports about foreigners and to statements to them.’ Similarly, Wesselius (2005:249-257) argues that Daniel is patterned not only on Ezra, but also on other OT (Joseph) and ancient (Greek and Latin) histories, such as that of Herodotus, but some of his arguments, especially regarding the purported relationship to ancient Greek and even Latin authors, seem rather forced. Though there is some truth in most of these propositions, none of them are completely convincing. Neither are arguments that the book first appeared in Hebrew, and then parts of it were translated into Aramaic or vice versa (cf. Collins 1993:12-13).

¹⁰ She mentions, for example, providing emphasis, establishing solidarity or creating distance, voicing ‘mastery, submission, or resistance,’ or simply marking ‘a shift in topic or new mode of discourse’ (Portier-Young 2010:104-105). Moreover, she notes that ‘[l]anguage choice also evokes and constructs particular sets of rights and obligations between speaker and addressee’ (Portier-Young 2010:105), and projects ‘a universe’ in which others are invited to join and share (Portier-Young 2010:106). Such is the case in Daniel where the tales show one way of living under

within the world of the visions, forsaking a stance of collaboration with the reigning Seleucid empire in order to adopt a posture of resistance rooted in the covenant' (Portier-Young 2010:98). Although I think that the reference to the 'Seleucid empire' is unnecessarily restrictive, her position is more convincing than any of the other suggestions.

In the past there have been many arguments on both sides of the debate regarding the possibility of dating the book to a certain era on linguistic grounds. In particular, the Persian and Greek loan words that appear in the book have been a matter of contention. However, Driver's statement that the 'Greek words *demand*, the Hebrew *supports*, and the Aramaic *permits*' a date after 300 BCE (Driver 1922:508; italics his) is no longer tenable.

Yamauchi (1981) has shown that there were contacts between the ANE and Greece long before the conquest of Alexander, and that the three Greek terms for musical instruments in Daniel 3 could therefore have become part of the vocabulary of Mesopotamia much earlier than normally assumed. Therefore the presence of these Greek words in Daniel are not conclusive of (i.e. they do *not demand*) a Maccabean date (Yamauchi 1981:47; cf. also Collins 1993:20, who states that 'the evidence for Greek influence on Daniel is too slight to prove anything'). In fact, if the book was written in the Maccabean era, it is surprising that there are not more Greek loan words (cf. Waltke 1976:325; Kitchen 1965:49), in particular where they might be expected, e.g. in a list describing political offices (such as *stratēgos*; Kitchen 1965:50). However, since Greek loan words 'are [also] conspicuous by their absence' in the DSS (Kutscher 1982:100), this last argument is not very strong.

Kitchen (1965:43) notes that the nineteen Persian loan words which he identifies in the Aramaic of Daniel are Old Persian, but Collins (1993:18) observes that many of these so-called Old Persian terms are in fact 'reconstructed on the basis of later Persian forms.' Therefore, the significance of this argument is diminished. What is, however, important is that most of these words are terms describing government officials or administrative offices. Collins (1993:19) notes that this does not *require* a pre-Hellenistic date for the Aramaic of the book, 'but it does weigh against the theory that the whole book originated in the second century.' He then argues that because 'extensive linguistic borrowing does not occur instantaneously' (Collins 1993:19) the later date is to be preferred. But since the terms are mainly describing government officials or offices, that

foreign rule (accommodation and collaboration) and the visions another (resistance and 'dis-identification' with the empire, but sole identification with the covenant of God; Portier-Young 2010:113). Incidentally, none of her arguments *demand* a second century date for the composition of the book, though she assumes it.

need not be so, especially if the exact equivalents did not appear in Aramaic or conveyed slightly different meanings (cf. Kitchen 1965:41-42; Steinmann 2008:10).

Whether the Aramaic in Daniel is of eastern or western diaspora origin is also not certain. Collins (1993:19) notes that '[i]n view of the pervasiveness of allegedly eastern features in Imperial Aramaic, linguistic observations can carry no weight in the discussion of the provenance of the stories in Daniel.' Kitchen (1965:79) observes in summary that the Aramaic of Daniel belongs to Imperial Aramaic¹¹ and that 'there is nothing to decide the date of composition of the Aramaic of Daniel *on the grounds of Aramaic* anywhere between the late sixth and the second century BC' (italics his).

As for the Hebrew of Daniel, Martin (1965:30) notes that nothing in it 'could be considered extraordinary for a bilingual or, perhaps in this case, a trilingual speaker of the language in the sixth century.' Archer (1974) suggests that compared to the DSS, the Hebrew of Daniel is markedly older. He looks at selected issues of syntax, morphology, spelling and pronunciation, and shifts of meaning in words that occur in Biblical and DSS Hebrew, and comes to the conclusion that in view of the developments exhibited in the scrolls compared to the MT 'there is absolutely no possibility of regarding Daniel as contemporary'¹² (Archer 1974:480). However, it seems that this is rather too optimistic a statement. Collins (1993:22) for example observes that the DSS support a late date for the Hebrew of Daniel, but that DSS Hebrew 'also shows developments beyond what we find in any biblical book.' Steinmann (2008:8) concludes that due to the mixed evidence in recent studies on the chronology of Hebrew, it is precarious to date the Hebrew of Daniel late (or, one might add, early). A more thorough investigation into the problem is beyond the scope of this work, but on the whole one may agree with Kitchen that the 'date of the book of Daniel ... cannot be decided upon linguistic grounds alone' (Kitchen 1965:79).

2.2.3 Historical Issues Related to the Dating of Daniel

Two aspects will be considered in this section, namely the statement of Daniel 1:1-2 and the historicity or otherwise of Darius the Mede.

¹¹ This is usually dated between 700 and 200 BCE (cf. e.g. Fitzmyer 2004:31).

¹² Archer (1979:143) argues, against Kutschera (1957:292) who dates the Genesis Apocryphon to the first century CE or the first century BCE, that the Genesis Apocryphon should be dated in the second century BCE. Archer's dating has been confirmed by Machiela (2009:142), who argues that the Apocryphon should be dated to the early second century BCE (he suggests 200-150, but does not rule out an even earlier date). This means that at least the Aramaic of Daniel is even earlier than this.

2.2.3.1 The Third Year of Jehoiakim and the First Year of Nebuchadnezzar

The statement in Daniel 1:1 that Nebuchadnezzar ‘besieged’ Jerusalem ‘in the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim king of Judah’ is problematic for two reasons. Firstly, it apparently contradicts Jeremiah 25:1 where Nebuchadnezzar’s first year is equated with Jehoiakim’s fourth year (cf. Collins 1993:130); and secondly, there is no extrabiblical reference to a siege of Jerusalem before 597 BCE. Regarding the first issue, Baldwin (1978:20-21) points out that Daniel and Jeremiah may well have used different dating systems (accession year reckoning versus non-accession year reckoning as first year of reign and spring new year versus autumn new year; cf. also Lucas 2002:50-51). If this is taken into account, the two dates do not really contradict each other.

On the second issue, Wiseman (1985:23) suggests that the Hebrew phrase **וַיִּצַר עָלָיו** ‘may mean nothing more than “showed hostility” or “treated as an enemy” and can denote action preliminary to, but not necessarily an actual siege (2 Kings 24:10-11).’¹³ Lucas (2002:51) explains that though there is no report of a siege of Jerusalem in 605 BCE, Nebuchadnezzar, after defeating Egypt at Carchemish, conquered ‘the whole region of Hamath’ (Wiseman 1985:17). After hearing of his father’s death, he quickly marched back to Babylon to claim the throne, only to return later to conquer ‘Hattu’ as well (this happened in the first half of his first full year; cf. Wiseman 1985:20). As a result of this, “all the kings of Hattu came before him and he received their heavy tribute” (Wiseman 1985:21). Wiseman (1985:21) continues to note that this would have included Jehoiakim of Judah, since he paid tribute to Babylon for three years (2 Ki 24:1; cf. Lucas 2002:51). Therefore the assertion by Porteous (1965:25) that ‘the very first statement in chapter 1 can be shown to be inaccurate’ overstates the point. There are difficulties, yes, but there is at least the possibility of reconciling them as Wiseman and others have suggested. Lucas (2002:52) rightly observes that ‘[w]hatever one concludes about the historicity of Dan. 1:1-2 (and a “not proven” verdict seems the most appropriate at present), it does not affect the main point that the author is making [These verses] are intended to provide a setting for the book in general and for the stories in chs. 1-6 in particular.’

¹³ Mercer (1989:183, n. 30) however thinks that this interpretation is unlikely, since **צִוֵּר** means ‘shut in, besiege,’ and since ‘spoils were taken from the temple.’ The form could not derive from **צָוֵר** (Hiphil), since in the Hiphil that word never occurs with **עַל** (Mercer 1989:183, n. 30). However, in Daniel 1:1 the verb **צִוֵּר** is apparently used in the Qal (according to the parsing guide in Logos). HALOT lists **צִוֵּר** II Qal as meaning ‘oppress, press hard’, but admittedly this does not occur with a preposition. Mercer (1989:186) continues to argue later that Daniel 1:1 could still imply a short siege ‘since the penalty was not harsh,’ and suggests that this may be the reason why it is not mentioned in the Babylonian Chronicles.

2.2.3.2 *Darius the Mede*

Much has been written about the identity of ‘Darius the Mede.’ Many scholars assume that Daniel mistakenly attributed the rule of Babylon soon after its fall to this ‘Darius’, while in fact Cyrus the Persian was king. They think that Darius the Mede was merely a fictitious figure (e.g. Collins 1993:348; Dequeker 1993:187) used by the author of Daniel either to accommodate the four kingdom schema including Babylon, Media, Persia and Greece (Collins 1993:348), or really referring to Darius I Hystaspes of Persia (Dequeker 1993:187).

Conservative scholars on the other hand continue to argue for the historicity of Darius the Mede and suggest historical figures that may be identified as such. Of the six possible characters mentioned by Shea (1982:230-235)¹⁴ the most likely candidates are either Gubaru the governor of Babylon (Whitcomb 1979:65), Gubaru the general who actually took the city of Babylon but died three weeks later (e.g. Shea 1971-1972; 1982), or Cyrus the Great himself (Wiseman 1965; see below). In my opinion, one of the last two options is most likely.

In a number of articles Shea argues for Gubaru/Ugbaru, the general. The main points in favour of this view are: 1. He was the one who led the ‘troops that conquered Babylon,’ which fits the information from Daniel 5:28 (Shea 1982:246); 2. he installed governors in Babylon, which fits Daniel 6:1-2 (Shea 1982:246); 3. he died soon after he became governor,¹⁵ which may mean that he was quite old, as indicated by the age reference in Daniel 5:31;¹⁶ 4. ‘Gubaru’s position as vassal harmonizes with the statement that he was “made king”’ (Shea 1982:246) as stated in Daniel 9:1.¹⁷

¹⁴ He lists: Astyages who is known from the Nabonidus Chronicle, but this option was soon abandoned (Shea 1982:231); Cyaxares II, who is mentioned in Xenophon’s *Cyropedia*, but who is equally unlikely (Shea 1982:231); Cyrus (see below for a more detailed argument; Shea 1982:232-233); Cyrus’ son Cambyses (a theory advocated for example by Boutflower 1923:145-146); Gubaru, governor of Babylon (Shea 1982:234) and Gubaru, the general who conquered Babylon (Shea 1982:235; Boutflower 1923:143-145 mentions this view, but he thinks that Gubaru the general and Gubaru the governor are one and the same person). Boutflower (1923:143) adds to this list Nabonidus and Darius Hystaspes. Nabonidus is an unlikely candidate since he was overthrown by the Persians, but Darius Hystaspes has had a number of proponents, e.g. Porphyry (Goldingay 1991:239; Dequeker 1993:187).

¹⁵ In 1982 Shea argued for about a year after he conquered Babylon (i.e. 538 BCE), but in 1996 he preferred the normal dating, i.e. about three and a half weeks after conquering the city (see the following footnote).

¹⁶ In a later article, Shea (1996) retracts his earlier arguments that Gubaru the general ruled over Babylon a whole year, not just three and a half weeks. He suggests that he may have been poisoned, together with his wife, and that it is this incident which is reported in the cuneiform record as ‘the wife of the king died’ (cited in Dandamaev 1989:47). Dandamaev (1989:56) however notes that ‘[t]his queen could only be Cassandane, the wife of Cyrus II and the mother of Cambyses.’ See Shea (1996:11-14) for a detailed argument. In that article he also proposes that Daniel is obliquely mentioned in the Nabonidus Chronicle. The same arguments are also advanced in Shea’s 2001 article ‘The Search for Darius the Mede (Concluded).’ It should be noted that for a brief spell Shea actually changed camps and supported Wiseman’s position that Darius the Mede is to be identified with Cyrus (Shea 1991), but he later went back to his previous stance.

¹⁷ For a more detailed argument of the position, see Shea 1971a, 1971b, 1972a, 1972b; 1982; 1996.

Against this view is the fact that nowhere in the presently known extant records is Gubaru explicitly called ‘king,’ and if the date of his death is 539 BCE, the time frame for all that he achieved and especially for gaining sufficient confidence in Daniel’s qualities to consider setting him over all the satraps in his realm seems rather too short (cf. also Steinmann 2008:291-293). Both Dandamaev (1989:59) and Grabbe (1988:202ff) point out that there is actually cuneiform evidence that Cambyses, Cyrus’ son, was king of Babylon in the first year of Cyrus (though he was later dethroned; he only remained king of Babylon for about 9 months; Dandamaev 1989:58), which is a serious point against Shea’s thesis. In addition, extrabiblical sources do not mention anything of the ancestry of Gubaru (i.e. his father’s name and tribe; cf. Wiseman 1965:11), but this is an argument from silence which can be neither proved nor disproved. A further difficulty is whether or not the Gubaru and Ugbaru mentioned in the Nabonidus Chronicle are one and the same person (e.g. Shea 1982:245; Kuhrt 1988:121-122 notes that ‘[a]t present, the problem is insoluble’). The above theory only works if they are in fact the same person.

Wiseman (1965:12-16) on the other hand suggests that Darius is to be identified with Cyrus, based on the reading of Daniel 6:28, which he believes should be translated ‘Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius, *even (namely, or i.e.)* the reign of Cyrus the Persian’ (Wiseman 1965:12, italics added). In other words, he translates the conjunction as *waw-explicativum* (or epexegetical *waw*; cf. Waltke & O’Connor 1990:653). Wiseman (1965:13) further argues that the reference in 9:1 to Darius as from the ‘seed of the Medes’ refers to the maternal, rather than the paternal ancestry of Cyrus. While he admits that this suggestion must remain theory (Wiseman 1965:15), he proposes that this solution does fit the facts known (such as Darius’ age – 62 years; that he received the kingdom – he was welcomed in Babylon; and that he appointed governors over his empire; Wiseman 1965:15-16), and it also takes the book’s own testimony seriously. Baldwin (1978:164) notes that if Wiseman’s suggestion is accepted the writer of Daniel 9 seems to state that since this king can claim descent from both the Medes and the Persians this would commend him to both. Those are the points in favour of this view. Against it is the fact that no extant extrabiblical material supports this identification (which is, of course, an argument from silence) and perhaps even more importantly the fact that elsewhere in Daniel Cyrus is explicitly named as the Persian king. Why would Daniel prefer in some chapters to give the king the name Darius, and in others the name Cyrus?

Goldingay (1991:239) observes that the Darius of Daniel 9 must be the same person as that mentioned in 6:1 [Eng. 5:31], rather than the historical Darius I, who was in fact the father of Xerxes I, not his son. Goldingay (1991:239) suggests that the confusion may have arisen due to ‘the order of events in Ezra 4’ which ‘might have suggested that

Xerxes (v 6) preceded Darius (v 24).’ He continues to make the interesting suggestion that the Persian word Khshayarsha (Xerxes = Ahasveros) like Dāryavaush (= Darius) may be a ‘throne name, meaning “hero among rulers”,’¹⁸ though Goldingay (1991:239) notes that the problem with this suggestion is that Khshayarsha is a Persian name. He further observes that in Esther the Greek version takes the name Ahasveros to refer to Artaxerxes, while in Tobit 14:15 the Greek ‘ΑΣΥΗΡΟΣ (Asueros) denotes Uvakhshtra or Cyaxares the Median conqueror of Nineveh in 612 B.C.’ (Goldingay 1991:239). Goldingay (1991:239) suggests that this person ‘may be seen as Darius the Mede’s predecessor/ancestor/father,’ and that ‘אחשורוש is actually as close a transliteration of Uvakhshtra (Akk. *U-ak-sa-tar*) as it is of Khshayarsha.’

While certainty regarding this issue is impossible and all solutions have problems, I prefer a view that takes the biblical witness seriously. Though to date no extrabiblical references to ‘king Darius the Mede’ have come to light, one should not hastily dismiss the biblical writer as having fictitiously invented such a person. ‘King’ Belshazzar was also for a long time not attested, yet evidence has come to light that Belshazzar did in fact exist.¹⁹ Though in the past I preferred Wiseman’s suggestion I now tend more towards Shea’s (2001) opinion that Gubaru the general is possibly to be identified with Darius the Mede. However, one cannot be dogmatic on the issue.

¹⁸ Frye (1962:97) explains that this throne name is derived from ‘*dārayat* plus *vahush* “having wealth (good things of life)”.’ He observes, however, that the ‘name Xerxes probably means “hero among rulers,”’ from the Old Persian ‘*khshaya-* plus *aršan*’ (Frye 1962:97).

¹⁹ Though Nabonidus was in actual fact king of Babylon at the time, he left his son Belshazzar in charge during his prolonged absence from the city by entrusting ‘the kingship to him’ (Baldwin 1978:21), and Baldwin (1978:21-22) notes that his name even appears in oath formulae, which ‘happened to no other king’s son in all of Babylonian history’ (Baldwin 1978:22). In other words, ‘Belshazzar is shown to have been king in all but name’ (Baldwin 1978:22), and Daniel’s statement that he was to be made the ‘third’ in the kingdom after Belshazzar is also in line with this information. Collins (1993:32) in contrast mentions that though Belshazzar had been entrusted with the kingship, he was *not* king as he could not officiate at the *akitu* festival. This is of course true. However, Gibson (2000:246) points out that there is no Hebrew or Aramaic word for the term ‘kingship’ that is used in the cuneiform texts. Therefore, he rightly argues, the writer of the chapter had to choose a word close enough to convey the same meaning, and the Aramaic word מלך ‘is a proper replacement for the Babylonian word rendered ‘kingship’ (Gibson 2000:247). His argument that Aramaic does not use the definite article and simply says ‘Belshazzar king’ (instead of Belshazzar, *the* king; Gibson 2000:248) is, however, incorrect (in fact in Daniel 5:1 the phrase מְלִכְאֲצַר מְלִכָּא appears), but he is right in noting that Belshazzar is never explicitly called ‘king of Babylon.’

Another problem related to Belshazzar is that Nebuchadnezzar is called his ‘father,’ which of course in the strict sense of the word is not true. However, the word אב can mean ‘ancestor’ (cf. Dn 2:23; Ezr 5:12; cf. BDB, CDCH), and, like its Hebrew cognate, probably does not need to refer to a direct blood relationship (cf. Gn 4:20; 1 Sm 24:11 etc. where no blood relationship is intended). If, as some presume (cf. Gibson 2000:248-249), Nebuchadnezzar was in fact Belshazzar’s grandfather, the problem is completely removed. Among the Shona people in Zimbabwe today the word ‘father’ is an honorary title that is used for older men one respects, even if they are not blood relations. In families, what we would more precisely call in English uncles or cousins are also called ‘father’ (often to the confusion of a European English speaker who has no idea about the precise relationships involved). See also Payne (1999:5).

2.2.4 Evidence from the DSS and Intertestamental Books

Among the DSS fragments eight manuscripts of the book of Daniel were found, two of them in Cave 1. Among the prophetic books, only Isaiah is represented more often (21x).²⁰ As noted above, the Daniel manuscript finds attest to the language changes from Hebrew to Aramaic in 2:4 and back to Hebrew in 8:1 (cf. Ulrich 1989:3-4; Ulrich 1990:30) and thus confirm the antiquity as well as the intentionality of these switches. All sections of Daniel are attested, except for chapter 12 (Flint 2001:330), but this is mentioned in the Florilegium (4Q174), which refers to ‘Daniel the prophet’ and quotes from Daniel 12:10 and 11:32 (4Q174 1 ii:3-4a; DSSEL). All the manuscripts found are quite close to the MT, though sometimes there are deviations considered closer to the LXX (Bruce 1966:57; cf. Flint 2001:330-331). However, none of the Greek additions (the prayer of Azariah, Susanna, Bel and the Dragon) are attested in these eight manuscripts (Hasel 1979:10; Flint 2001:331; Ulrich 1990:30). The book was obviously ‘considered as a sacred and authoritative book at Qumran, on a level with other books we later consider canonical scripture’ (Ulrich 1990:31).

It is significant that one of these manuscripts (4QDan^c) is dated to the late second century BCE (Ulrich 1989:18; cf. Cross 1995:43), usually between 120-115 BCE (Steinmann 2008:17), which means it is no more than about half a century older than the proposed final edition of the book around 164 BCE (Steinmann 2008:17; Cross 1995:43). Steinmann (2008:17-18) points out that this time frame seems to be far too short to allow for the final composition, acceptance and veneration as genuine prophecy and thus as authoritative for the Jewish sects in the Hellenistic and early Herodian era, and the dissemination of the book (cf. also Hasel 1990:44; Harrison 1969:1127). Especially precarious in this regard is the fact that according to the late dating of the book it would have been known that the prophecies about Antiochus’ death were wrong and Daniel thus proved to be a false prophet (cf. Steinmann 2008:18). The fact that Daniel was received as a true prophecy at Qumran would seem to indicate that the book was accepted much earlier than the Maccabean era (cf. Steinmann 2008:18).²¹

Further support for an earlier date may emerge from other scrolls also. Scholars are divided among themselves whether the War Scroll’s references to weaponry and war

²⁰ In a table listing all the biblical books discovered among the DSS, VanderKam & Flint (2002:150) record the following frequencies: Psalms 36; Deuteronomy 30; Isaiah 21; Genesis 20; Exodus 17; Leviticus 15; Numbers 8; the Twelve 8 etc. (all figures refer to Qumran scrolls only). In other words, only 6 other biblical books have been copied more often than Daniel at Qumran.

²¹ Steinmann (2008:13-17) proposes that Ben Sira may have known Daniel. Though he never explicitly referred to the book, Steinmann suggests Ben Sira 3:30 may be an adaptation of Daniel 4:24 (Steinmann 2008:14); Ben Sira 36:10 may have parallels to Daniel 8:19 and 11:27 and 35 (Steinmann 2008:14-15), and Ben Sira 36:22 may be reminiscent of Daniel 9:17 (Steinmann 2008:15-16). Though these are mere suggestions, they are intriguing and could point to the fact that Daniel was indeed written earlier than proposed by the majority of scholars.

strategy are Maccabean or Roman (see the section on the War Scroll below). If the former, the dependence of that scroll on Daniel would seem to preclude a date for Daniel as late as the Maccabean war in the second century BCE.

Apart from the eight Daniel manuscripts, nine other scrolls ‘found at Qumran are relevant for the study of Daniel’ (Flint 2001:329). Because of its similarity to Daniel 4, the most important of these is perhaps the Prayer of Nabonidus (4Q242), which is dated to 75-50 BCE, though Daniel is not named in that composition. Flint (2001:334) notes that the ‘precise relationship between the Qumran text and Daniel 4 is difficult to determine; indeed the reconstruction of the Prayer is to some degree dependent on this relationship.’ This of course brings with it the problem of circular reasoning: the prayer is somehow related to Daniel, but the relationship to Daniel is also used to reconstruct it. Cross (1995:124) believes that the Prayer ‘preserves a more primitive form’ of the tale reported in Daniel 4 (cf. also Collins 1998:186). Some scholars, e.g. Anderson (1984:49),²² consider Daniel 4 to be dependent on it; but could it not be that the prayer in fact is dependent on Daniel?²³ There are similarities and differences between the Prayer and Daniel 4, and depending on one’s viewpoint the one or the other are emphasised, but Collins (1993:218) rightly notes that ‘[t]he fragmentary state of the document [i.e. the Prayer] does not permit us to claim a direct literary relationship. The stories may be different developments of a common tradition.’ In other words, this is another instance where a ‘not proven’ verdict seems to be most prudent.

In his article on 4Q552-553 Hogeterp (2010) observes that though these manuscripts (labelled 4QFour Kingdoms^{a-b} and considered part of the so-called Daniel Qumran cycle) are dated paleographically to 50-25 BCE (4Q552), 100/75-50 BCE (4Q553) and 50 BCE (4Q553^a), their content is likely pre-Qumranic. Suggested dates range ‘from the late fourth to the mid-second century BCE’ (Hogeterp 2010:176). He notes that ‘4Q552-553 represents a stage in the literary history of the Daniel tradition in which Danielic thought, the four kingdom scheme, was considered the object of ongoing

²² Anderson (1984:49) points out that against the dependence of the Prayer on Daniel is the fact that the name of Nebuchadnezzar has been substituted for a less well known one (Nabonidus). Cross (1995:124) notes that in Daniel 5 Belshazzar is called the ‘son’ of Nebuchadnezzar. He thinks that Daniel 1-5 originally contained stories about Nebuchadnezzar, Nabonidus and Belshazzar, but that during the process of oral transmission the name change occurred and that now we find in chapter 4 ‘Nebuchadnezzar’ where perhaps originally ‘Nabonidus’ was meant. However, having said this, like Collins he observes that there need be no direct literary dependence of Daniel on the Prayer, nor need the Prayer have originated before Daniel 4. ‘The prayer may simply derive from a parallel, but more conservative line of orally transmitted material’ (Cross 1995:124; cf. also Collins 1998:186).

²³ Steinmann (2002:557, 561; 2008:219) in fact makes just this suggestion. He notes that only few scholars have previously suggested that the Prayer of Nabonidus may indeed be dependent on Daniel rather than the opposite, e.g. Dommershausen (1964:85). Obviously such dependence cannot be proved, in the same way as dependence of Daniel on the Prayer cannot be proved (Steinmann 2002:570; 2008:227-228), but perhaps it is more likely that the Prayer drew on Daniel rather than vice versa (Steinmann 2008:227-228).

prophetic vision' (Hogeterp 2010:183). He thinks that the work may contain 'contemporizing exegesis in comparison with Dan 7:4-8,' which 'would follow currents of thought represented by Dan 10-11 and a pseudo-Danielic tradition of Qumran' (Hogeterp 2010:189). He also suggests that the four kingdoms include 'Greece, the kings of the South and North (Dan 11:5-6) or a king of Assyria and Egypt (4Q246 1:6), and the Kittim, i.e. the Romans' (Hogeterp 2010:190).²⁴ Hogeterp (2010:190-191) concludes that the 'parabiblical character of 4Q552-553 should not be conceived of in terms of close textual dialogue with a fixed biblical text but in terms of an elaboration of Danielic thought as part of a literary tradition that conceived of Daniel as prophecy.' It appears to me that, if these texts indeed come from pre-Qumranic times, even if only in the same tradition as Daniel, a date as late as the mid-second century BCE for Daniel seems to be unlikely.

A similar observation may also apply to 4Q243-244, which are dated paleographically 'to the early 1st century CE', but whose content may have come from 'between the beginning of the second century BCE and the coming of Pompey' (Flint 2001:341). However, according to Flint (2001:340), this pseudo-Daniel work 'is not closely modelled on the biblical book,' and it is indeed no longer certain whether it is in fact dependent on it at all (cf. also Collins 1998:189).²⁵ Thus these two manuscripts are not useful for any comments on the dating of the book or on the relationship to Daniel beyond the fact that they mention his name and are set at a Babylonian court.

Another text, however, is more significant. 4Q246, also labelled the 'Son of God' text or 'Aramaic Apocalypse' is reminiscent of Daniel 7 (Collins 1998:190).²⁶ The script is dated to the last half of the first century BCE (Cross 2003:152), but the 'original composition must go back to the early second century' BCE (Cross 2003:152). Collins (1998:190) believes that the text is indeed messianic and depends on Daniel, but '[w]hether that dependence is only a matter of a few phrases, or whether the whole text should be seen as an interpretation or updating of Daniel, remains uncertain' (Collins

²⁴ Flint (2001:363) notes that contra Daniel where in his opinion 'the kingdoms are Babylon, Media, Persia, and Greece,' in 4Q552-553 'they extend from Babylon-Persia to either Rome or the eschatological kingdom of God.' It is to be noted, however, that others consider the divisions of the kingdoms in Daniel as Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome (e.g. Steinmann 2008:57; Barker 1995:1301 [NIV Study Bible chart]).

²⁵ Collins (1998:188) points out that some of the alleged references to Daniel depend on disputed readings and restorations. It used to be held that there were allusions to the 'seventy years' and the four kingdom schema in these scrolls. However, the reference to the seventy years 'does not necessarily refer to the Babylonian exile as it did in Daniel 9' (Collins 1998:188), and the reference to the four kingdoms is no longer certain (Collins 1998:188).

²⁶ Cross (2003:153) is more assertive and suggests that since the text has many affinities with Daniel, 'we are dealing here with a lost portion of the Daniel literature.' Like Collins, Cross (2003:154) thinks the text is messianic. Collins (1998:190) suggests that if the text is indeed messianic, it must be later than Daniel 'since there is no evidence of messianic expectation in [the] Maccabean period,' and therefore it is more likely that 4Q246 has borrowed from Daniel rather than vice versa.

1998:196). If the date of the composition were proved to be the early second century BCE, this would indicate that at least Daniel 7 is older than the Maccabean era.

Lastly, there are three Intertestamental books, namely Tobit, Enoch (esp. The Book of Watchers) and Ecclesiasticus (Ben Sira), which seem to refer to Daniel and may depend on it (rather than the other way round; cf. Beckwith 2002:81). Beckwith (2002:76) argues for a late third or early second century dating for Tobit, and suggests that Tobit 14:4-5 may be drawing on Daniel 2, 7, 8, 9 and/or 12 (Beckwith 2002:77, 81). If this could be substantiated, it would certainly indicate a much earlier date for these chapters than the Maccabean period.

Similarly, Enoch's *Book of Watchers* (possibly to be dated to the third century, cf. Beckwith 2002:78) is related to Daniel, but it is usually argued that Daniel knew Enoch (Collins 1993:59). However, the problem appears to be a somewhat circular reasoning: it is assumed that Daniel's visions are second century, hence the knowledge must have been Enoch's, not Daniels. But could it not have been the other way round, and could that not in fact indicate that the substance of Daniel's visions come from a much earlier date? This is what Beckwith (2002:77-79) argues.

Ben Sira can be dated more exactly than Tobit and Enoch to about 180 BCE (cf. Beckwith 2002:80).²⁷ Usually it is presumed that Ben Sira did not know Daniel since Daniel is missing from Ben Sira's list of famous figures. However, Beckwith (2002:81) suggests that the prayer in Ben Sira 35 may be reminiscent of Daniel 8 or 10-12. Steinmann (2008:13-17) adds to this a few other references in Ben Sira that may also be dependent on Daniel (chs. 4, 8-9, 11; cf. n. 21 above). While absolute certainty is impossible, together with other evidence these observations indicate that the usually held view of a second century BCE date for Daniel may at least be questioned.

2.2.5 Conclusion: Date, Unity, Purpose and *Sitz im Leben* of Daniel

From the above it is obvious that the dating of the book of Daniel is a more complex issue than is sometimes assumed, both by conservative and more liberal scholars. It appears that a priori assumptions of early or late dating are not really warranted, and a more cautious approach should be taken on both sides. One issue that has not been discussed so far is the

²⁷ Pusey (1868:299) however suggested a 3rd century date for Ben Sirach (cf. also a little later Hart 1909:249-266, esp. 259-260). If this were correct and if Ben Sirach did really rely on Daniel rather than the other way round, this would definitely push back the date of Daniel at least to the beginning of the third century BCE, if not much earlier than that.

belief or lack of it in the possibility of prediction of distant future events. I fully hold to such a belief (i.e. that God is indeed able and willing²⁸ to make the future known to his people), and therefore also assume that at least the gist of the visions as they appear in the book of Daniel we have today was indeed given to Daniel at the times stated in the book, perhaps written down partly by himself (the visions) and partly by sympathetic ‘disciples’ (the stories and editions of the visions), but gathered together probably during the century after the last vision had taken place. Daniel would have been conversant both in Hebrew and Aramaic (which would explain the easy shift of languages in the book²⁹), as would his first readers have been (the exiled community in Babylon in the fifth century BCE). That there was some further editing is obvious; so is the fact that during Maccabean times the book would have had particular relevance for believers. The final edition may even have been made in the second century BCE, but in my opinion these redactions would not have substantially altered the content of the book. In other words, I believe that essentially the book that we have is a unity³⁰ and comes from a real person who indeed had these visions at the times stated in the book. However, as it is, the evidence in favour of either an early or late dating is not as certain as is sometimes assumed, but since the majority of scholars take a second century dating for granted, I have pointed out some issues that may at least question this view. In the exposition below I have also occasionally had the opportunity to take up the issue of dating.

In my opinion, a date earlier than the second century would explain better the rise of the vast Danielic literature that evolved later. For a Jewish work to choose as obscure a pseudonym as ‘Daniel’ (if a second century pseudonymic author is presupposed) seems rather strange, considering the fact that other apocalypses were named after some

²⁸ For this reason I do not agree with Goldingay’s sentiment that God ‘declines to give information about the future of a concrete or dated kind It is difficult to see how the God of the Bible would reveal detailed events of the second century to people living in the sixth, even though he could do so’ (Goldingay 1991:321). Of course he is right that God wants his people to live by faith (Goldingay 1991:321), but when the visions were given to Daniel, he did not know (nor did his readers know) that these visions were to come true, partly to the letter, in a few centuries’ time. In addition, the visions are extremely vague and the historical events identified not always as certain as is made out (see esp. Wildgruber 2013:134-162). In my opinion, God simply used the medium of these visions to warn the exiles that life in exile was indeed precarious, and that even when they were allowed to go back to their homeland, there always existed the danger that their totalitarian overlords could turn out to be persecutors rather than supporters of their faith. Examples of this were given in Daniel 3 and 6, but worse might, and indeed did, come.

²⁹ I think this argument also fits well with the studies of Portier-Young (2010) mentioned above, though she holds to a second century dating. However, if one removes the reference to the Seleucid era in her conclusion, it can be applied to a late sixth or early fifth century dating too.

³⁰ Obviously, this is just as debatable an issue as is the dating of Daniel, but the scope of this work prevents me from going into detail. For the unity of the book, but a Maccabean dating cf. Rowley (1950-51:233-273); for a unified structure and true prophecy rather than *vaticinium ex eventu* for the visions cf. Gooding (1981:43-79). Against unity and for Maccabean dating (which is the current majority of opinion) cf. Collins (1993:24-52; 61-71). Cf. also Gammie (1976:191-204) and introductions in other commentaries, e.g. Redditt (1999:11-18); Hill (2008:25-30); Steinmann (2008:1-19). Wesseliuss, arguing for the unity of the book (Wesseliuss 2005:249) and second century dating (Wesseliuss 2005:274), describes it as a ‘dossier about Daniel, with various documents about episodes in his life and his visions in more or less chronological order, with only loose connections between them’ (Wesseliuss 2005:242).

significant ancient biblical figure (Enoch, Abraham, Moses). Even if the Daniel of Ezekiel is considered identical with the Ugaritic Dan'el, this holds, because it is in my opinion even less likely that a non-biblical figure's name would be chosen as a pseudonym for a Jewish work.

The purpose of the book appears to be twofold. Firstly, it emphasises that God is in control of history, no matter how difficult the situation may be for his people, and that history is going towards a final goal, namely towards what Christians describe as the 'kingdom of God.' Secondly, it encourages believers of any age (whether they live(d) in the fifth or second century BCE or, for that matter, the 21st century CE) to live lives of faithfulness before Yahweh, if possible within the political system that exists, but also knowing that this may not always be possible. In the latter case, believers are called to endure persecution, even to the point of death if necessary, but are assured that their reward will be eternal life.

Depending on the dating of Daniel the *Sitz im Leben* of the book would either be the experiences of the exilic community in Babylon (if a late 6th or early 5th century or even a 4th/3rd century BCE date is assumed) or the Jews fighting against Hellenization in the Maccabean era (if a 2nd century BCE date is assumed). In case of an early date and Babylonian setting, the message of the tales would be more important and applicable for the community, but Daniel 3 and in particular the visions of Daniel 7-12 would warn the readers that the apparently benevolent rule of the Persians could quite easily turn more hostile. In case of a 2nd century BCE Maccabean setting in Judah the visions would be of paramount significance to the readers and give them hope and strength to persevere the persecutions they had to endure. I find it difficult to identify the significance of the tales for a second century audience. Though I believe the date to be much earlier than that, I would like to conclude with La Sor, Hubbard and Bush (1982:662) that

The book of Daniel was not intended to exhaust itself in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, or the Roman destruction of Jerusalem, in A.D. 100, 1844 or even 1984 [or 2014]. It was intended "for the time of the end," and to proclaim to any who believe that theirs is such a time of dire persecution that "the Most High rules," and that the saints of the Most High will inherit a kingdom which shall never be destroyed.

2.3 Explanatory Notes on Daniel 9 with Particular Reference to Covenant Terminology

Daniel 9 is the first chapter of the book in which the word *בְּרִית* occurs. Though it appears only twice, the chapter is in fact replete with covenant language, hence the whole chapter receives detailed treatment.

2.3.1 Preliminary Issues

2.3.1.1 The Place of Daniel 9 in the Book

Daniel 9 is the third vision in the second half of the book, the second of the visions recorded in Hebrew, and the fourth of five vision reports, if one considers Nebuchadnezzar's dream in chapter 2 as part of the visions. The first two (or three) visions deal expressly with the four-kingdom schema, which is briefly introduced in chapter 2, and receives further elaboration in chapters 7 and 8 (though in Dn 8 the focus is on only two of the kingdoms). There has been much debate about the identity of the four kingdoms. The majority of scholars nowadays would opt for Babylon, Media, Persia and Greece (e.g. Collins 1993:166; Lucas 2002:189), while a significant minority argues that the kingdoms are Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece and Rome (e.g. Young 1949:74-75; Baldwin 1978:147). In my opinion the latter makes more sense in Daniel 7 (I would go so far as to say that the fourth kingdom of chapter 7 is actually still future), while the former makes more sense in Daniel 2. In addition, both chapters actually mention five kingdoms, the fifth one being the 'kingdom of God' which in each case is the final kingdom that supersedes and overpowers all the previous ones. In my opinion the actual focus of the book is on the final inauguration of that kingdom, which is preceded by a time of unprecedented horror and persecution for the people of God.

Furthermore, each of the vision reports gives more detail about the different kingdoms that appear, in particular the last one which precedes the inauguration of the kingdom of God. In Daniel 2, the setting is the second year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign where the four kingdoms are only briefly introduced, and the focus is on the Babylonian kingdom, which will be superseded by three other kingdoms before the kingdom of God will arrive. The fourth kingdom is described somewhat more specifically than the others (in the explanation of the dream in Dn 2:44-45). In Daniel 7, set in the first year of the Babylonian 'king' Belshazzar, this four kingdom scheme is presented in the form of four ferocious hybrid-beasts, each one more peculiar than the previous one. All of them are described in somewhat more detail than the statue's constituents in chapter 2, and the

fourth one in even more detail than the previous three. However, in chapter 7 too these kingdoms are finally superseded by the kingdom of God, which is described in terms of a court scene before God. Daniel 8, set in the third year of ‘king’ Belshazzar, focuses on just two of the kingdoms of chapter 2 and gives a brief analysis of how the second of the two overpowers, apparently effortlessly, the first one. The focus of the chapter is then on the last part of this kingdom, which exhibits features similar to the last beast of chapter 7 and will ultimately be destroyed – presumably, though not explicitly stated in this chapter, by the coming kingdom of God (‘not by human power’; Dn 8:25 NIV).

Daniel 9 is set in the ‘first year of Darius’ the Mede, and is, as noted, different in structure from the previous vision reports in that it begins with a lengthy prayer and ends with a brief ‘vision’ report, that is presented as the ‘answer’ to Daniel’s prayer. The ‘vision’³¹ in Daniel 9:23-27 deals with the destiny of the people of God during the four empires, but focuses again on the last period before the end of that kingdom. It only alludes to the first three kingdoms (by noting that the city will be rebuilt, but in times of distress) and focuses on the fourth, which will turn out to be the most devastating for the ‘saints of the Most High.’ But once again, as in the previous visions, the fourth kingdom will not last forever – there will be an ‘end’ to it (9:27). The vision does not specify what this entails, but it seems that it hints at the kingdom of God, namely in the statement of verse 24 that ‘everlasting righteousness’ will be brought about during the period of the seventy sevens.

The vision of chapters 10-12 is set in the third year of the reign of the Persian king Cyrus. Daniel expressly seeks guidance and clarification from God through three weeks of fasting and mourning, as a result of which he receives the revelation reported in 10:12-12:4. In this regard this vision is similar to chapter 9 where Daniel also seeks the Lord through prayer and supplication, but in chapter 9 the prayer is reported, whereas in chapter 10 it is merely assumed. The setting of the last vision is reported in much more detail than any of the others (it takes up the whole of chapter 10). The vision report of chapters 10-12, like that of the previous chapters, focuses on the last (Greek?) empire with particular reference to the time of destruction wielded by its last ruler (usually identified as Antiochus Epiphanes, but, I believe, pointing to an even more wicked, future eschatological time). The details of the previous chapters referring to this time are now significantly expanded. References to the Babylonian empire are obviously missing since that kingdom had already been superseded by Persia. The Persian kingdom receives only

³¹ I have deliberately enclosed this word in quotation marks, as this seems to be more an audition than a vision. Albani (2010:216) rightly observes that the issue in this chapter is not the interpretation of a vision, but of a scripture.

the briefest of comments (Dn 11:2),³² and then the author concentrates on Greece, which is only once mentioned explicitly, in Daniel 11:2. Once again, the vision finishes with the predicted destruction of the last king of the four kingdoms, and the arrival of the kingdom of God is depicted in terms of an unprecedented reference to the resurrection of the dead (12:1-3). Chapter 12 closes with an epilogue that makes reference to ‘time, times, and half a time’ (cf. 7:25) and the final completion of human history.

2.3.1.2 *Literary Analysis – Issues of Genre*

Daniel 9 contains a break in the sequence of apocalyptic visions begun in Daniel 7 in that it includes a long prayer of repentance³³ before in verses 20-27 a rather obscure ‘explanation’ or ‘answer’ for the prayer is given. Therefore, this chapter comprises several genres: a brief introduction, followed by a communal prayer of confession and ‘petition for mercy’ (verb forms and suffixes in the prayer referring to the person praying are all 1cp) and then a ‘brief epiphany (9:21), followed by an angelic discourse (vv. 22-27),’ which marks the high point of the chapter (Collins 1993:358). The angelic discourse in verses 21-27 has been described as a meditation (Towner 1984:127-128; Redditt 1999:150), *midrash* or *peshet*³⁴ on Jeremiah 25:8-14 and 29:10. The focus of the *midrash* is a single phrase, ‘seventy years,’ not a whole passage (Collins 1993:359), which reinterprets Jeremiah’s seventy years’ duration of the Babylonian exile to enable the contemporary readers of the second century writer³⁵ to identify their own situation under Antiochus Epiphanes with the disaster that led to the exile (Towner 1984:128).

Links with chapter 8 are found in the way the introductory verses take up the theme of ‘understanding’ with which chapter 8 closed (noting that there Daniel did ‘not understand,’ Dn 8:27), the reappearance of Gabriel, and the word ‘transgression’ (עֲוֹנוֹתָא),

³² One might argue that this points to a second century dating when Persia was no longer an entity to reckon with, but in my opinion this need not be the case. It may of course point to a fourth century setting when Persia was on the brink of being obliterated by Greece, but if it was of no consequence whatever it seems more likely that reference to Persia would have been excluded altogether.

³³ Boda (2008:82) lists Daniel 9 among the penitential prayers of the Persian period which he proceeds to discuss in his article. The purpose of these prayers, including Daniel 9 is ‘to bring an end to the devastating effects of the fall of the state: either to captivity, oppression, or the sorry condition of Palestine’ (Boda 2008:83). As key features of such prayers he lists the expression of the emotional distress of the people, the admission of their sins, and a list of what he calls ‘credos,’ i.e. characteristics of God that express both his greatness in general and his justice in bringing about judgment on the people, but also emphasize his covenant loyalty and mercy, which ultimately is the basis for the petition to relent and forgive (Boda 2008:83ff). Van Deventer (2012:215-224) finds a number of allusions to and echoes from penitential passages and psalms.

³⁴ The way in which this text from Jeremiah is interpreted is reminiscent of the Pesharim discovered among the Dead Sea Scrolls, even though the word פִּשְׁרָא used there does not appear in Daniel 9 (Collins 1993:359; cf. also Goldingay 1991:231; Lacocque 1979:177). It is, however, found in the Aramaic section of the book (e.g. 2:4-7; 4:3; 5:7; 7:16 etc.).

³⁵ Collins (1993) and Towner (1984) both presume a second century dating. For a late sixth, early fifth century audience the prayer would still be relevant if they questioned the fact that all was not going well in Judah (cf. Ezr & Neh).

which occurs in 8:12, 13 and 9:24. Because of such links, both Towner (1984:127-128) and Goldingay (1991:238) believe that chapter 9 may contain some further clarification of the vision in chapter 8. Goldingay (1991:239) suggests that the prayer ‘is that of the model Israelite in exile who has been portrayed in chaps. 1-6,’ and surmises that it might have been the kind of prayer Daniel might have prayed after Darius became king. However, he disagrees with Bickermann (1979:16) who saw the prayer as the centre of the whole book.

2.3.1.3 The Significance of the Prayer in Daniel 9 for the Chapter and the Book as a Whole

Many scholars consider the prayer of Daniel 9:1-19 an intrusion (e.g. Hartman & DiLella 1978:245), both due to its subject matter (a prayer of confession, reminiscent of the psalms of lament, rather than a plea for illumination) and due to its good classical Hebrew³⁶ (the rest of the Hebrew of Daniel is difficult and contains a lot of Aramaisms; cf. Seow 2003:136). But even if the prayer is an adaptation from a different source, its central place in the book indicates that the author/editor put it there for a purpose (cf. Collins 1993:347).³⁷ Daniel prays in fulfilment of the injunction in Leviticus 26:40³⁸ (Collins 1993:347; cf. Wilson 1990:97; Bergsma 2007:218³⁹). Smith-Christopher (1996:122) suggests that the prayer was included here because it links with the appearance of Gabriel later on. The angel appears because such prayers, usually accompanied by fasting and addressed to God, ‘are part of an exilic tradition of calling God to spiritual warfare’ and thus part and parcel of ‘diaspora life’ which ‘passed on into Scripture’ (Smith-Christopher 1996:122). The occasion of such prayers are ‘times of great danger or distress’ (Smith-Christopher 1996:122). A number of verbal agreements speak for the deliberate inclusion and composition of the prayer here. Jones (1968:491) mentions, among others, the

³⁶ Wallace (1979:154) however astutely observes that the difference in language may simply be due to the fact that ‘Daniel’s prayer language was dominated by what he found in the books’ he was studying.

³⁷ Similar forms of prayer are found elsewhere in the OT (e.g. 1 Ki 8:15-53; Ezr 9:6-15; Neh 9:6-37) as well as in extrabiblical literature (e.g. 4QDibHam and 2 Baruch; cf. Davies 1985:61), and Daniel 9 is still used ‘in the Jewish liturgy for the Day of Atonement’ (Davies 1985:61).

³⁸ ‘If they confess their iniquity and the iniquity of their forefathers, in their unfaithfulness which they committed against Me, and also in their acting with hostility against Me— ... or if their uncircumcised heart becomes humbled so that they then make amends for their iniquity, then I will remember My covenant with Jacob, and I will remember also My covenant with Isaac, and My covenant with Abraham as well, and I will remember the land’ (Lv 26:40-42, NASB).

³⁹ Bergsma (2007:218) suggests that Daniel realized that the seventy years of Jeremiah’s prophecy were over, but as yet there had not ‘been any sign of the restoration of Judah and Jerusalem’ ... because ‘the requisite repentance of Jer 29:12-13, Lev 26:39-42, and Deut 30:1-4 ha[d] not taken place.’ Hence, ‘Daniel’s prayer is not a plea for illumination, but [an] ... attempt ... to repent on behalf of his entire nation.’ Similarly Kline (1974:456) believes that the prayer ‘fulfils the *Todah* requirement stipulated in the pattern of covenant lawsuit administration in Leviticus 26:40.’ *Todah* is defined as ‘the public act of acknowledging the glory of God in his attributes and the grace of God in his actions toward the people whom he has chosen in solemn covenant’ and ‘includes Israel’s confession of her sins’ (Kline 1974:457). Moreover, ‘the common concern of these prayers is the broken covenant’ (Kline 1974:457) and they are usually followed by covenant renewal ceremonies (Kline 1974:457 refers to Ezr 10:3ff and Neh 10:1ff).

following: ‘The oath (שְׁבָעָה) [which] is poured out ([וַתִּתֵּן]) ... in the prayer’ (9:11) is paralleled by ‘the weeks (שָׁבָעִים)’ which are both decreed (נִקְדָּשׁוּ) and ‘poured out (תִּתֵּן) before the end’ (9:24, 27; cf. Kline 1974:453, n. 4).⁴⁰ Jones (1968:492) rightly observes that the artistry with which these forms are linked ‘tie the chapter together and reveal it as a carefully constructed unit.’

However, even if the prayer was deliberately included, the question of whether or not the prayer and the interpretation of history in Daniel 9:24-27 reflect the general theology of the book is debated. In Collins’ opinion, the answer is no, and the emphasis of the book ‘is ... on the sin of the gentile “beasts”’ (Collins 1993:359-360). Others, however, disagree. Lucas (2002:251) for example observes that since in Daniel 11:30-35 and 12:10 ‘some of the Jews violated the covenant and shared responsibility for Antiochus’ deeds, ... a sharp distinction cannot be made between the sins of Antiochus and those of Israel.’ He therefore believes that ‘the theology of the prayer does not *contradict* what is said elsewhere; it simply *complements* it’ (Lucas 2002:251; italics his).

Boccaccini (2005:40) goes even further and affirms that the prayer and its theology are not only compatible with the apocalyptic ideology of the author, but are essential to an understanding of the whole book of Daniel, especially the visions (Boccaccini 2005:41-42).⁴¹ He rightly states that the prayer gives ‘the reason history is degenerating’ (namely because of Israel’s sin in breaking God’s covenant), and shows the consequences of God’s curse on both individuals and the community at large (Boccaccini 2005:42). Both the prayer and the interpretation in verses 24-27 are ‘consistent with the principles of Zadokite covenantal theology’ (Boccaccini 2005:43; Lucas 2002:250 calls it ‘deuteronomic theology’) as outlined in Leviticus 26. Daniel 9 affirms that since Israel had broken God’s covenant, she was punished ‘with seventy years of exile’, but since the people refused to repent and continued to be hostile to God, ‘God multiplied the punishment “sevenfold” and the seventy years became “seventy weeks of years” (Dan 9:24)’ (Boccaccini 2005:43; cf. also Goldingay 1991:232). Boccaccini (2005:44) concludes that ‘the main goal and accomplishment of the author of Daniel’ was that he ‘utilized the apocalyptic imagery ... and consciously included it within the framework of a covenantal theology.’

In other words, the prayer in Daniel 9 is not an intrusion but an integral part of the chapter and indeed the book as a whole. This is not only proven through the centre

⁴⁰ In addition, the temple is called ‘desolate’ in the prayer (מִקְדָּשׁוֹ הַשְׁמָדָה), a root that is repeated three times in 9:26 and 27 (מִקְדָּשׁוֹ הַשְׁמָדָה, v. 26; שְׁמָדָה עַל-יְהוָה, v. 27) (cf. Jones 1968:491; Kline 1974:453).

⁴¹ Van Deventer (2012:212) similarly argues, ‘[o]n the basis of thematic and linguistic aspects,’ that Daniel 9 ‘is intended as [the] focal point in Dan[iel] 8-12.’ He also refers to Boccaccini’s study (Deventer 2012:212-213).

stage it takes in the visions section, but also through the fact that it complements rather than contradicts the theology of other parts of the book (cf. Lucas 2002:251). The prayer explicitly states what is only hinted at in Daniel 1:1-2, namely that both captivity and exile were the result of Israel's own sin, not the failure of Yahweh or the mere whims of a Babylonian king (cf. Longman 1999:218-19). There may be a similar hint in Daniel 8:12 where it is said that 'on account of transgression the host will be given over *to the horn* along with the regular sacrifice' – the reason why this part of history is allowed to run its course as it does is because of the 'transgression.'

Moreover, in my view the prayer deliberately tempers the determinism of the visions. While Daniel believes in the fulfilment of prophecy, he also knows that there is a human element as well, namely the need for prayer and confession. This is in line with what he says to Nebuchadnezzar when he intimates that Nebuchadnezzar could avert God's judgment if he followed Daniel's advice to forsake his sin and pride, but if he did not repent he would suffer the consequences (Dn 4:27). As for the interpretation of the visions, history may run its predetermined course (the exile will end; the people will return to their own land; Jerusalem will be rebuilt), but that does not mean that human responsibility no longer applies. The faithful are always called to continue being faithful in prayer and walking in the ways of God. The allusion to Leviticus 26 makes it clear that intercessory and penitentiary prayer will play its part in the fulfilment of prophecy.

This is also reflected, or at least alluded to, in the visions: their fulfilment is not the result of mere determinism, but God's people also have a role to play by being faithful to him and his covenant. Daniel 11:33 and 12:3 refer to those having 'insight,' who shall 'give understanding to the many,' 'shine brightly,' and 'lead others to righteousness;' whereas Daniel 11:32 says that 'the people who know their God will display strength and take action.' They are not passive observers, but active participants in the predicted events. It is not stated explicitly how they will 'give understanding to the many' or how they 'will display strength and take action,' but obviously prayer, including penitential prayer, is one of the actions that would be fitting in the context.

2.3.2 Daniel's Prayer (9:1-19)

2.3.2.1 Introduction to the Chapter (9:1-2)

Daniel 9 starts with a date reference (בְּשָׁנָה אֶחָת לְדָרְיָוֶשׁ), repeated in verse 2 (בְּשָׁנָה אֶחָת (לְמַלְכוּתוֹ)), perhaps to emphasise that 'Darius' was 'a throne-name, adopted for the first year

[of the king's reign] only' (Baldwin 1978:164), rather than a gloss.⁴² The prayer and subsequent declaration by Gabriel take place in the 'first year of Darius,⁴³ son of Ahasveros, of Median descent' (בְּשָׁנָה אֶחָת לְדָרְיוֹשׁ בְּרֵאֶחָשְׁוֹרֹשׁ מִזְרַע מִדְּיָהּ), who is said to have been 'made king' (הֵמְלִיךָ), the only reference in the HB of the Hophal of מִלֵּךְ.⁴⁴ It is not quite clear what the author wanted to express with this verb form. Perhaps he referred to someone who gave this Darius the authority to reign, e.g. Cyrus (in which case Wiseman's suggestion [1965:12-14] that Darius the Mede is to be identified with Cyrus cannot hold), or it could refer to the authority that God bestows on rulers (cf. Miller 1994; Seow 2003:138). Since in Daniel 2:21 it is stated that it is God 'who removes kings and establishes kings' (NASB) it is perhaps best to adopt this latter suggestion.

The chapter continues with a brief first person account in which Daniel explains how he came to utter the prayer that is then reported. He draws attention to himself by emphasizing his identity: 'I, Daniel, was considering...' (אֲנִי דָנִיֵּאל בְּיַנְיָהּ), as if to note that he is the same person as that in the previous chapters of the book who has the experiences he is about to report. He states that he 'was considering (בְּיַנְיָהּ) in the scrolls/books the number of years which came [as] Yahweh's word to Jeremiah the prophet, to complete/fulfil the desolations of Jerusalem: seventy years' (my rather literal translation, but cf. NASB). The word בְּיַנְיָהּ is 'irregular or faulty' in form (Lacocque 1979:175),⁴⁵ but however the grammatical construction is interpreted, in the context it means 'to consider, notice, pay attention to' (cf. HALOT).

⁴² Baldwin (1978:163-164) makes this suggestion assuming that Darius and Cyrus may be one and the same person. Montgomery (1927:359) proposes that the point of the repetition is to stress the date of the overthrow of the Babylonians which heightened the hope of the Jewish exiles that their liberation was at last at hand (cf. also Lucas 2002:235).

⁴³ On the identity of Darius the Mede cf. the section on the dating of the book.

⁴⁴ Some scholars have preferred to emend the form to a Hiphil 'and he became king', arguing that the MT is a 'misunderstanding of the original Aramaic אִמְלֵךְ (*aphel*)' (Lacocque 1979:175). Theodotion also translates 'he reigned' (Lacocque 1979:175), whereas OG has 'they [i.e. the Medes] reigned.' In view of the three different interpretations of the verb by MT, Theodotion and OG the MT is to be preferred as the more original as well as the more difficult reading.

⁴⁵ According to the Westminster Hebrew Morphology (Logos Bible Programme) it is a Qal perfect 1cs form. Goldingay (1991:226) suggests that it is a shortened Hiphil perfect 1cs form (cf. Gesenius [2003a] §73a; see also Hartman & DiLella 1978:241). Montgomery (1927:361) notes that this is unlikely, and suggests that it rather uses a Piel form in analogy to double Ayin verbs, and might have been used like the Syriac equivalent 'which ... has the sense of "interpret, expound"....' Hartman & DiLella (1978:241) note that to understand the form as a Qal, meaning 'understand,' instead of a Hiphil, meaning 'cause to understand, give understanding to' is against 'the whole tenor of the chapter; Daniel needed a revelation precisely because he did *not* understand the sense of Jeremiah's prophecy.' That does, however, in my opinion not militate against considering the verb as a Qal. Daniel tried to understand, but also prayed for revelation to help his understanding. Davis (2013:115) rightly observes that 'Daniel is not mystified or baffled by Jeremiah's prophecies; he is stirred by them' to pray that God may indeed fulfil his promise. Similarly, Kline (1974:454) observes that 'Daniel's prayer does not ... express perplexity, but importunity' or urgency.

The plural ‘books’ or ‘scrolls’ (בְּסֵפֵרִים; note the definiteness: ‘the books’)⁴⁶ seems to imply that Daniel was studying a number of different scrolls, not just Jeremiah. On the other hand, Pfrommer de Long (2012:223) argues that in the MT the plural סֵפֵרִים is used mostly for letters, not longer documents, and believes that the reference is to the letters in Jeremiah 29 (cf. Wilson 1990⁴⁷; Hill 2008:160). However, though Daniel 9:2 explicitly refers to Jeremiah (in whatever form Daniel may have had it), in view of the fact that it is mentioned only later in the sentence, it appears that he read Jeremiah in the light of other scrolls as well. The use of Deuteronomic language makes it likely that at least the Torah (notably Dt 7; 28; Lv 26), and possibly other books as well, were among them. If a second century dating of the book is accepted, then the similarity of the phraseology in verse 4 to Nehemiah 1:5 would also suggest a knowledge of some of the later Writings, such as Nehemiah and part or all of Chronicles. Besides, it is evident that Daniel considers what he reads as the binding and authoritative revelation of God, as indicated by his use of the prophetic revelation formula ‘the word of the Lord [that] came to Jeremiah’ (הָיָה דְבַר-יְהוָה) (אֶל-יְרֵמְיָהּ).⁴⁸ Nevertheless, it is unlikely that a fixed canon of scripture existed yet.⁴⁹

Daniel is disturbed by the reading of these ‘scriptures’ as he realizes that the destruction of his native land, especially of Jerusalem and the Temple, and the exile of his people were God’s just punishment for Israel’s failure to keep the covenant. He particularly ponders the fact that God had decreed ‘seventy years’ for ‘the *completion* of the desolations of Jerusalem’ (לְמַלְאוֹת לְהַרְבּוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם). ‘Completion’ here refers to both the time it takes to finish ‘the desolations of Jerusalem’ as well as the fact that God was faithful to his promises and threats (in this case of destruction; cf. Kaiser 1999:505). Wood (1973:233) opines that the force of the whole construction ‘is to say that God’s assigned period for Judah’s captivity called for a certain number of years to fill it,’ i.e. seventy years. He also suggests that the plural term הַרְבּוֹת stresses intensity: the city was in utter ruin (Wood 1973:233).

⁴⁶ The word סֵפֵר has quite a broad range of meaning, referring to anything written, from short (legal) documents such as a certificate of divorce or a letter to quite long documents such as the ‘Law of Moses’ or the annals of a kingdom or the writings of a prophet (cf. BDB; HALOT; Swanson 1996; Patterson 1999; Kühlewein 1997).

⁴⁷ Wilson (1990:93) suggests that the plural סֵפֵרִים may well indicate Jeremiah’s letters to the exiled community in Babylon in Jeremiah 29 (he rightly identifies two letters in that chapter: 29:1-23 to the exiles in general, and 29:24-32 a ‘response to critical letters from Shemaiah the Nehelamite’). Jeremiah 29 explicitly mentions the 70-year exile, and the spelling of Nebuchadnezzar (instead of Nebuchadrezzar, as elsewhere in Jeremiah) is the same as in Daniel (Wilson 1990:93). Jeremiah 29:12-14 indicates that in order for God to restore the exiled community at the end of the 70 years, the exiles will have to seek God with all their heart. The same theme is of course reflected in the prayer of Daniel 9 (Wilson 1990:95). Wilson’s opinion is attractive, but considering the sentence structure in Daniel 9:2, I prefer the view advocated below.

⁴⁸ This, incidentally, is the first time the divine name יְהוָה appears in the book.

⁴⁹ Goldingay (1991:240) thinks that though the use of the plural form of סֵפֵר ‘suggests the existence of an identifiable collection of authoritative religious writings ... this need not imply a precisely defined and closed “canon”’ (similarly Miller 1994:241; Collins 1993:248; Lucas 2002:235). When I use the word ‘scripture’ in the following exposition, it is with this proviso in mind.

But how is the phrase ‘seventy years’ to be understood? This has been a *crux interpretum* ever since the chapter was written. The problem is that if one takes the number literally, several starting and end points for the seventy years are possible (Lucas 2002:235-236). Starting points could be Nebuchadnezzar’s first appearance in the Levant in 605 BCE,⁵⁰ or the deportation in 597 BCE, or the final destruction of the temple and the deportation of the Jews in 587/86 BCE. End-points then would be respectively Cyrus’ capture of Babylon in 539 BCE, Cyrus’ ‘decree allowing the Jews to return’ and build a temple in 538 BCE, the actual start of the rebuilding of the temple in 520 BCE or its completion in 516 BCE (Lucas 2002:235).

In view of these uncertainties, it seems better to interpret the number figuratively, rather than as an exact figure, perhaps indicating simply a rounded number (e.g. Steinmann 2008:435), or a lifetime (Collins 1993:349; Lucas 2002:235; Smith-Christopher 1996:121). ‘Seventy’ may also indicate ‘fullness’ or ‘the totality desired and ordained by God’ (Rengstorf 1964:628). A seventy-year period ‘of destruction or subjugation was an established typological motif in the ancient Near East’ (Fishbane 1988:480; cf. Luckenbill 1925:167; McComiskey 1985:40). Such figurative interpretations of seven and multiples of it are particularly significant in ritual texts (e.g. Lv 4:6, 8:11 etc.; cf. Otto 2004:353, 355), apocalyptic literature (esp. the number seven, e.g. Rev 1:4; 5:1 etc.) and in blessing and curse formulae (cf. Lv 26:21, 28 etc.; Dt. 28:7, 25; cf. Otto 2004:352-3). As noted above, a reference to Leviticus 26, especially the curse section, seems to be in view as well.

Baldwin (1978:164) suggests that with the expression ‘for the completion of the desolations of Jerusalem, *namely*, seventy years’ (NASB) the ‘writer implies that the years of desolation were fulfilling some role, and had to take their course before any new building could take place.’ She further notes that ‘[s]eventy years was the fixed term of divine indignation’ (cf. Zech 1:12), during which ‘the land ... enjoyed its sabbaths ... until seventy years were complete’ (2 Chr 36:21; NASB). Baldwin (1978:164) goes on to argue that ‘[t]his ritual understanding of the term takes it beyond the merely numerical into the theological and ethical realm,’ and that ‘theologically the important point was that restoration marked acceptance with the Lord, who, by restoring His people to their land, demonstrated that He had forgiven and reinstated them (Is. 40:1ff).’

⁵⁰ Orr (1956) interprets it this way. He suggests that originally the prophecy in Jeremiah 25 referred not to Israel’s time in exile, but to the rule of the Babylonians, counted from 605 BCE onwards, when Nebuchadnezzar first came to the Levant (cf. esp. Orr 1956:305). These 70 years of Babylonian rule were, however, later reinterpreted by the Chronicler (2 Chr 36:21) and Daniel (9:2) to refer to the time of destruction for Jerusalem (Orr 1956:306).

2.3.2.2 Daniel's Prayer of Repentance (9:3-19)

In verses 3-19 Daniel addresses his God. Daniel 9:3-4a introduce the prayer. Verses 4b-15 combine confession with affirmation of God's justice in meting out judgment on Israel. Verses 16-19 contain Daniel's plea to God to turn away from his wrath and act in mercy towards Jerusalem and the temple.

2.3.2.2.1 Introduction to the Prayer (9:3-4a)

Having realised that the time of the redemption of Jerusalem according to Jeremiah was drawing near, Daniel reports that apart from studying the scriptures he also took action by turning his heart to God in prayer, fasting and supplication.⁵¹ He calls God 'Lord⁵² God'⁵³ (אֲדֹנָי הָאֱלֹהִים), also in 9:9, 15).⁵⁴

Daniel tells his readers that he 'sought [God by] prayer and supplication,' לְבַקֵּשׁ. The infinitive construct of בָּקַשׁ, to seek, 'is awkward' (Lucas 2002:228). Lucas (2002:228) suggests (with Goldingay 1991:226) that '[t]he lack of a preposition before the nouns ("to seek *by* prayer [and supplication]") can be explained as an Aramaism' (emphasis added). There are two terms used for prayer. The first one, תְּפִלָּה, is the normal word for prayer,⁵⁵ the second one, וְתַחֲנוּנִים, 'specifies the kind of prayer'

⁵¹ וְאָתַנְנָה אֶת-פְּנֵי אֲלֹהֵי אֲדֹנָי הָאֱלֹהִים לְבַקֵּשׁ תְּפִלָּה וְתַחֲנוּנִים בְּצוּם וְשֵׁק וְאֶפְרַח וְאֶתְפַּלְלָה לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵי וְאֶתְנַהֵג וְאֶמְרָה 'So I gave myself [lit. my face] to the LORD God to seek [him by] prayer and supplication, by fasting and [in] sackcloth and ashes, and I prayed to the LORD my God and I confessed and I said...' (my translation; Dn 9:3-4a). Seow (2003:140) and Hill (2008:162) suggest that the 'setting of the face' may allude 'to the practice of facing Jerusalem' when praying.

⁵² The divine title אֲדֹנָי is very frequent in the OT, but seems to be particularly popular with the prophets (almost three quarters of 439 occurrences), especially Ezekiel (217 occurrences; cf. Eissfeldt 1974:62-63). Eissfeldt (1974:63) states that the expressions YHWH 'adonai or 'adonai YHWH are more suited to prayers ('adonai appears 55 times in Psalms) and prophetic speeches than ordinary narrative material. אֲדֹנָי means "'owner, ruler, or sovereign" and identifies Yahweh as the owner and ruler of the universe' (Miller 1994:242). It is possible that it is a plural of majesty when applied to God (cf. Alden 1999:13). Fretheim (1997:275), however, prefers an association 'with the authority of the word of God,' especially when it appears in the messenger formulae, and hence notes that the 'universal authority of God may ... be the basic sense of the word.'

⁵³ The word אֱלֹהִים is the general designation for the God of Israel throughout the OT, though occasionally it may refer to the gods of the nations. Fretheim (1997:405) suggests that the plural form 'has reference to intensification or absolutization or exclusivity (say, God of gods)' rather than implying a plural of majesty. The combined title יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים appears first in Genesis 2 where it may imply that Yahweh, Israel's God, is none other than the 'universal creator God' (Fretheim 1997:406). However, in Daniel 9 it appears that the stress is on the fact that God is the covenant God of Israel, who entered into a covenant with them, but whom they have continuously spurned by breaking his covenant. Kline (1974:456) rightly observes that the title YHWH is 'the peculiarly covenantal name of God;' this is especially the case in the prayer of Daniel 9.

⁵⁴ The divine title אֱלֹהִים does not occur in Daniel 8. In Daniel 1:2, 9, 17 and 9:3, 4, 9-11, 13-15, 17-20 it refers exclusively to the God of Israel, Yahweh, and if it does not have a pronominal suffix it always appears with the definite article, as if to distinguish it from the general designation 'gods' which appears in the Aramaic section (chapters 2 to 6 only) and in Daniel 11:8 and 37. The combined title אֲדֹנָי הָאֱלֹהִים (or אֲדֹנָי אֱלֹהֵינוּ; it is most common in Deuteronomy (21x) and Jeremiah (16x) out of 89 occurrences) appears in 9:3, 9, 15, and the expression יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ (or יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ) in 9:4, 10, 13-14, 20. The two combinations seem to be used interchangeably, and when one considers the MT pointing, no difference in pronunciation is noticeable. Elsewhere in the chapter, Daniel uses either simply אֲדֹנָי, אֱלֹהִים, or יְהוָה (and אֵל) to address God directly. Hill (2008:162) correctly remarks that this title serves to remind the reader that Daniel is a member of God's covenant community, and 'calls attention to God's obligations to his people Israel as covenant-maker.' The rest of verse 4 makes this even more explicit.

⁵⁵ Stähli (1997:993) observes that the word is often used in conjunction with lament psalms and suggests that the conjunction of תְּפִלָּה with תַּחֲנוּנִים emphasizes this. There seems to be an allusion to Jeremiah 7:16 and 11:14 where

(Goldingay 1991:227). This latter term is related to the verb *חָנַן*, to be gracious, and thus indicates that Daniel seeks God’s grace and compassion in his prayer. Yamauchi (1999:304) mentions that the word is a less formal way to express ‘the outpourings of a troubled soul,’ and this would fit the present context well. Daniel does so with ‘fasting, sackcloth and ashes’, all signs of mourning, grief, humility and deep earnestness on the part of the person who prays. That there were regular fasts during the exilic period is attested in Zechariah 7:1-7. Wood (1973:234) insightfully remarks that the lack of a preposition before the nouns indicates that it was not *what* Daniel sought, but ‘his heart attitude in seeking’ that was important, and that the phrase *וְתַחֲנוּנָיו* simply tells the manner in which he did so. The words used for prayer do not ‘necessarily imply that Daniel was asking for revelation’ since the phrase *לְבַקֵּשׁ תְּפִלָּה* ‘may mean, not “to seek in prayer”, but “to pray earnestly”’ (Porteous 1965:136; cf. also Wilson 1990).⁵⁶

Daniel not only prays (*וַיִּתְפַּלֵּל*), but he also ‘confesses’ (*וַיִּתְוַדֵּה*) and speaks⁵⁹ to God. Miller (1994:243) observes that the emphatic position of the verb ‘pray’ shows Daniel’s fervency and intensity, a fact that is stressed throughout the prayer. By noting that he ‘confesses’ as well as appeals to God, and by using first person plural verbs in the prayer, Daniel, like Nehemiah (e.g. 1:6), identifies himself with his people, and shares ‘in the blame for [their] sins’ (Steinmann 2008:436).

2.3.2.2.2 Confession and Affirmation of God’s Justice in Judging His People (9:4b-15)

2.3.2.2.2.1 *Daniel 9:4*

In terms of the purpose of this study, Daniel 9:4b and 27 are the most important verses of this chapter because of their explicit reference to covenant. (Verse 27 will be considered below.) However, as will be seen, the whole prayer (Kline 1974:456), indeed the whole chapter (cf. Kline 1974:455), is replete with covenant language, even where the word *בְּרִית* does not occur.

God forbids Jeremiah to pray for the people using a number of different verbs for prayer, including *פָּלַל*. Daniel, in contrast, now does indeed use different types of prayer to implore God on behalf of his people.

⁵⁶ Porteous (1965:136), arguing for a second century dating of Daniel and believing the prayer to be the voice of the pious Hasidim who persisted in their Jewish faith, nevertheless similarly observes that the purpose of the prayer was not to ask for illumination, but to express the piety of the community whose representative the writer was.

⁵⁷ Hitp impf 1cs cons *פָּלַל* with emphatic *ה*.

⁵⁸ Hitp impf 1cs. According to BDB and HALOT, the Hithpael of *וָדַה* means ‘confess.’ Pace (2008:287-288) suggests a link with the confession used ‘in the Yom Kippur ceremony’ in Leviticus 16:21-22. She believes that Daniel 9 was addressed to the community suffering under Antiochus Epiphanes, and though in those trying times sacrifice and other Jewish rituals were proscribed, ‘prayer and confession for the individual and community are still possible’ (Pace 2008:288).

⁵⁹ *וַיִּשְׁאֶרֶץ*; Qal impf. 1cs cons *אָמַר* with emphatic *ה*. Waltke & O’Connor (1990:544) call this a pseudo-cohortative form, which occurs ‘in the parts of Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah where the narrative is in the first person,’ but ‘rarely elsewhere’ (and never in Chr, Zech, Est) in the Bible.

The prayer proper begins with an extensive address that heaps up titles for God. Daniel calls God ‘the great and to-be-feared (or ‘awesome’) God’ (הַאֵל הַגָּדוֹל וְהַנּוֹרָא),⁶⁰ i.e. a God not to be trifled with. The definite article indicates that he is the only God who can be so described; in view of the Babylonian polytheism that is the assumed setting of the chapter, Daniel affirms the qualities of the one and only true God. He alone is great – exalted, above all other so-called gods – and he alone is awesome, to be feared and revered. The reason for this reverence towards God is that he is שֹׁמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד, the ‘keeper of the covenant and the faithfulness’ (note the definite article on both words). Wood (1973:235) suggests that the fact that both words have the definite article means that Daniel uses ‘both words as appellative nouns, employed in a generic sense.’ The idea is ‘that God keeps *all* covenants He makes and then *always* extends steadfast love to man in his frailty and inability to live up to them’ (Wood 1973:235; italics his). Wood (1973:235) thinks that the significance of the whole phrase is that ‘God not only graciously makes covenant with man, but also extends necessary love toward man as man finds himself falling short of meeting his responsibilities in the covenant.’

2.3.2.2.2.1.1 Excursus: The Expression שֹׁמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד in the MT with Particular Reference to Daniel 9:4

In order to establish which covenant is meant in Daniel 9:4, this section will explore the use of the phrase שֹׁמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד in the MT. Apart from the present verse, the exact phrase שֹׁמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד occurs in Deuteronomy 7:9, as well as in 1 Kings 8:23, 2 Chronicles 6:14, Nehemiah 1:5 (without the definite article on חֶסֶד), and in Nehemiah 9:32. It appears that Daniel first and foremost refers to Deuteronomy 7 where the phrase occurs in the context of Moses’ farewell speech to the Israelites on the brink of their entering the land of Canaan after forty years of wilderness wanderings. There, Moses warns the Israelites that when they enter the land of Canaan they must not make treaties/covenants with the inhabitants of the land, lest they be led astray to follow other gods and so become unfaithful to Yahweh, their covenant God. Moses argues that God had not chosen them and made a covenant with them because of any virtues of Israel, but simply because of his sovereign choice and grace, and (perhaps even more so) because he kept the covenant that he had made hundreds of years earlier with their forefathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. This appears to be the significance of the definite article on the word בְּרִית; it points to a particular covenant, and at this stage the only reference point seems to be the Abrahamic covenant.

⁶⁰ In Daniel the short form אֵל only occurs here and in 11:36 where in his vision Daniel sees the antichrist figure exalting himself above all gods (עַל-כָּל-אֱלֹהִים), including the ‘God of gods’ (אֵל אֱלֹהִים), i.e. Israel’s God.

By delivering Israel from slavery in Egypt, God had proved to be the covenant-keeping and covenant-faithful God. This is the God who is שֹׁמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד in blessing to those who are also faithful to him, but who is שֹׁמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד in judgment to those who turn away from him. Just as God had been faithful to his covenant and grace that he promised to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, so he proved himself to be faithful also to Israel and the covenant he had made with them at Mt Sinai. The whole history from the exodus to the present moment as Israel was about to enter Canaan was one great story of God's continued faithfulness even in the face of Israel's frequent unfaithfulness. Moses uses this fact to exhort the Israelites to covenant loyalty. Later on in the book of Deuteronomy (chs 27-28) Moses outlines and repeats (from Lv 26, with adaptations) the curses that would befall Israel should they fall away from their covenant loyalty to Yahweh and commit idolatry. To these Daniel refers later in his prayer as he confesses his own and his people's sins.

In 1 Kings 8:23-53 (cf. 2 Chr 6:14-42⁶¹) Solomon's prayer on the occasion of the dedication of the first temple is recorded. Like Daniel, Solomon starts his prayer by extolling God's virtues, though in slightly different terms: 'there is no God like You in heaven above or on earth beneath' (1 Ki 8:23, NASB). Also like Daniel, Solomon continues to refer to God's covenant keeping and faithfulness 'to his servants who walk before' him 'with all their hearts' (לְעַבְדֶיךָ הַהֵלְכִים לְפָנֶיךָ בְּכָל־לֵבָם). A particular example of such a 'servant' is David, Solomon's father, with whom Yahweh made a special covenant (see 2 Sm 7). In this context, the definite article on בְּרִית indicates that the word refers not primarily to the Sinai covenant but in particular the Davidic covenant (2 Sm 7). Solomon then explains how God had shown himself to be the שֹׁמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד with David (1 Ki 8:15) and prays that he would continue to do so by providing descendants to Solomon who would reign over Israel as kings, as Yahweh had promised David (v 16; cf. 2 Sm 7:12-16). He indirectly also refers to the promise of God that David's son would build a house for God, as has now happened as Solomon prays.

From this it appears that in 1 Kings 8 the phrase שֹׁמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד refers primarily to the covenant with David, but I suggest that due to the similarity of this prayer with Moses' exhortation in Deuteronomy 7:9 and its reminiscence of Exodus 20:6 and Deuteronomy 5:10 (the second commandment) the reference is not only to the Davidic

⁶¹ The Chronicles text varies only very slightly from that in 1 Kings. The basic point of the prayer is the same in both texts; therefore, it is not necessary to list the minor differences in style between the two chapters. Some of the more significant differences between the accounts in 1 Kings and 2 Chronicles which were pointed out in Linington (2003b:41-43) are not relevant for the present discussion.

covenant, but also to the commandments and stipulations of the Sinai covenant (cf. Linington 2006a, esp. p. 131; Linington 2006b, esp. pp. 674-676).

The closest wording to Daniel 9:4 is found in Nehemiah 1:5, with only two differences: Nehemiah 1:5 has no definite article on *הַקֹּדֶם*, and Nehemiah addresses his prayer to ‘Yahweh, the God of heaven, the great and awesome God’ instead of to ‘the Lord, the great and awesome God.’ Nehemiah 1:5 reads: *אָנָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם הָאֵל הַגָּדוֹל וְהַנּוֹרָא שִׁמְרֵ הַבְּרִית וְהַקֹּדֶם לְאַהֲבָיו וְלִשְׁמֵרֵי מִצְוֹתָיו*; Daniel 9:4 reads: *אָנָּה אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם הָאֵל הַגָּדוֹל וְהַנּוֹרָא שִׁמְרֵ הַבְּרִית וְהַקֹּדֶם לְאַהֲבָיו וְלִשְׁמֵרֵי מִצְוֹתָיו*. With such obvious similarity the question arises ‘who borrowed from whom?’ Young (1949:185) notes that some scholars have suggested that Daniel borrowed from Nehemiah. However, could it not be that the borrowing may be the other way round and that Nehemiah borrowed the phrase from Daniel? It is assumed that Daniel borrowed from Nehemiah because the Maccabean date for the former is taken for granted. Perhaps the very fact that Nehemiah may have borrowed from Daniel is proof against that assumption. Daniel (or the editor of the book) is fond of the title ‘the God of Heaven’ elsewhere; why would he have left out the reference to this expression if he was borrowing from Nehemiah? And since he used the title Yahweh in the introduction to the prayer and later in verse 10, why would he have changed it to ‘Lord’ here? It appears that since Nehemiah’s prayer is more expanded than Daniel’s, the dependence is more likely to be on Nehemiah’s part (cf. Young 1949:185; Steinmann 2008:437).

Alternatively, since similar wording also occurs in Deuteronomy 7:9 (*וְיָדַעְתָּ* (*כִּי־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים הָאֵל הַנֶּאֱמָן שִׁמְרֵ הַבְּרִית וְהַקֹּדֶם לְאַהֲבָיו וְלִשְׁמֵרֵי מִצְוֹתָיו לְאַלֹּף דֹּר*), it is equally possible that both Nehemiah and Daniel drew on this source rather than on each other. In Deuteronomy 7:9 Moses exhorts the Israelites to ‘know that Yahweh, your God, he is God, the faithful God, keeper of the covenant and faithfulness to those who love him and who keep his commandments to a thousand generations’ (my translation). Both Daniel and Nehemiah may have adjusted this phraseology to their own purposes as they prayed to God for the forgiveness of their own and their people’s sins. Since both Daniel and Nehemiah were living in a polytheistic environment at the time their prayers were uttered (according to the setting of the texts), they may have found it necessary to assert the character of God as greater than any other so-called gods and as the one who really is awesome.

Nehemiah 1 points out that God proved himself to be the *שׁוֹמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַקֹּדֶם* in that he brought judgment on unfaithful Israel. Nehemiah reminds God (1:9) of his promise, that in case the people should be scattered as he had threatened (e.g. Lv 26; Dt 28), he had also promised that if they returned to him and humbled themselves by admitting their sins and

confessing them to Yahweh, he would bring them back to their land, their city and their temple (cf. Lv 26:40; Dt 30:4). The reference here is obviously the Sinai covenant. Though Israel had acted wickedly, they were still God's own people and Nehemiah pleads with Yahweh to act in accordance with his covenant promises in their plight. In this, the prayer is similar to Daniel 9 which goes into much more detail to describe and confess the speaker's and his people's sins.

The wording of Nehemiah 9:32 is similar to that in Daniel 9:4, though there are significant differences in context. Nehemiah 9:32 reads: *וְעַתָּה אֱלֹהֵינוּ הָאֵל הַגָּדוֹל הַגִּבּוֹר וְהַנּוֹרָא שׁוֹמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֲסֵד אֱלֹהֵינוּ לְפָנֶיךָ אֵת כָּל־הַתְּלָאָה אֲשֶׁר־מְצַאֲתֵנוּ לְמַלְכֵינוּ לְשָׂרֵינוּ וְלְכֹהֲנֵינוּ וְלְנָבִיאֵנוּ וְלְאַבְתֵּינוּ וְנֹאֲתַפְלְלָהּ לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵי וְנֹאֲתַנְדָּה וְנֹאֲמַרְהָ אָנָּה*.⁶² Daniel 9:4 reads: *וְנֹאֲתַפְלְלָהּ לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵי וְנֹאֲתַנְדָּה וְנֹאֲמַרְהָ אָנָּה*.⁶³ Only the phrases in italics are the same. Nehemiah 9:32 adds the divine title 'the mighty (one)' before 'the awesome (one),' which appears neither in Daniel nor in Deuteronomy 7 or Nehemiah 1. Daniel 9 is the beginning of a prayer of confession. Nehemiah 9:32 comes in the middle of a long prayer, which outlines the sins of Israel in far greater detail than do either Daniel 9 or Nehemiah 1. Before verse 32, the prayer in Nehemiah 9 is uttered by the Levites and gives a detailed account of the history of Israel, including God's faithfulness and Israel's unfaithfulness. After the statement concerning God's greatness and covenant faithfulness, Nehemiah 9:32-35 continues to admit the culpability of all the people who were united in their apostasy: leaders, kings and princes/officials, priests and prophets, all their forefathers, and in fact, all people. Not only had they been unfaithful in the past, they even continued to be unfaithful until the present day (i.e. the time of the prayer). As a result of their apostasy, God, the *שׁוֹמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֲסֵד*, who had been faithful in bringing about blessings on Israel by granting them their own land and king, had now been faithful in bringing about judgment on the apostate nation, as he had promised in his commandments to them. Here apparently the reference is to God's covenant with King David, though the context implies that the Sinai covenant is not far from the Levites' minds either.

Although Yahweh had allowed Israel to come back to their own land, they were still 'slaves' to the Persians; their city and temple still lay in ruins, and though they were allowed to live in the land, it did not belong to them as it had in the past. In fact, all its produce went to pay tribute to the Persians, not to feed themselves. Because of this, the

⁶² 'Now therefore, our God, the great, the mighty, and the awesome God, who keeps covenant and lovingkindness, Do not let all the hardship seem insignificant before You, Which has come upon us, our kings, our princes, our priests, our prophets, our fathers and on all Your people, From the days of the kings of Assyria to this day' (NASB).

⁶³ 'I prayed to the Lord my God and confessed and said, "Alas, O Lord, the great and awesome God, who keeps His covenant and lovingkindness for those who love Him and keep His commandments' (NASB).

Levites and the people agree to make a covenant with the Lord whose stipulations are set out in Nehemiah 10:28-39, and which is signed by the leaders (Nehemiah 10:1-27).

Thus one may conclude that apart from the phraseology in Nehemiah 9:32a, there is not much direct verbal correspondence between this chapter and Daniel 9. The verbal similarity is greater between Nehemiah 1:5 and Daniel 9:4. Similar observations apply to Solomon's prayer in 1 Kings 8 and 2 Chronicles 6 and to the exhortations of Moses to Israel in Deuteronomy 7 and Daniel 9. Though there are not many direct verbal correspondences, the themes of Daniel 9 and Nehemiah 1 and 9 are similar in that all three contain prayers of confession that use similar phraseology. The immediate referent of *בְּרִית* varies: in Deuteronomy it seems to be the Abrahamic covenant, with implicit reference to the Sinai covenant; in the two scriptures that mention Solomon's prayer the immediate referent of *בְּרִית* is the Davidic covenant, while once again the Sinai covenant may well be implied. In the two references in Nehemiah, the first is apparently to the Sinai covenant, while Nehemiah 9 seems to imply firstly the Davidic covenant with its promise of an enduring monarchy, though even here the Sinai covenant is implied through the listing of the long history of God's faithfulness and Israel's fickleness from the exodus to the present day of the writer.

In Daniel 9, because of the similarity in wording with Deuteronomy 7 and the allusions to the covenant curses in Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28 later in the prayer, it is probably the Sinai covenant that is meant, though this does not exclude the other covenants, in particular the Abrahamic one.⁶⁴ Zobel (1986:60) is a little too assertive when he suggests that the 'double use of the definite article serves the purpose of making the covenant refer *unambiguously* to the Sinai *b'rit*, with the result that *hesed* is understood as Yahweh's faithfulness to this covenant' (italics added). He notes that the reminder that humans in turn must 'love' God and 'keep his commandments' further emphasises this notion (Zobel 1986:60).

2.3.2.2.2.1.2 Terms Related to Covenant in Daniel 9:4: *תָּקַד* and *אָהַב*

Apart from the word *בְּרִית*, there are a number of other terms in Daniel 9:4 that often appear in conjunction with covenant. One of these is *תָּקַד*. Daniel 9:4 states that God 'keeps the

⁶⁴ Miller (1994:244) thinks that the covenant meant here must be the Abrahamic one since Daniel's point is to pray for the return of the people to their land and it is this covenant in which God 'promised Abraham a land and national existence for his descendants, Israel (cf. Gen 12:1-3; 15:18-21)' (cf. also Hill 2008:164). As noted, in my opinion the two options are not exclusive of each other, but rather complementary. Wood (1973:235) in fact suggests that in the present context the word 'covenant' 'may be used as an umbrella term for Yahweh's covenantal tradition with Israel (i.e., the covenants with Abraham, Israel at Mount Sinai, and David)' (cf. Hill 2008:164).

covenant and the *faithfulness* (דִּקְוָה) to those who love him and who keep his commandments.’ It seems this is a reference to the second commandment where God prohibits the making of idols (one of the reasons for the exile, according to e.g. Ezekiel 8-11), and tells the people that though he will punish those who break this particular injunction to the third and fourth generation, he will keep ‘steadfast love (דִּקְוָה) to thousands of those who love me and keep my commandments’ (Ex 20:6; Dt 5:10, ESV; cf. also Ex 34:7).

Generally it may be noted that in the OT דִּקְוָה has a strong relational aspect, either between humans, or between humans and God, and always includes both attitude and behaviour (cf. Baer & Gordon 1997:211; Zobel 1986:51). Humans are required to act with דִּקְוָה towards each other (e.g. Zech 7:9), but only God can bestow דִּקְוָה on humans, not vice versa (Zobel 1986:62), at least not in the same sense that God bestows דִּקְוָה on people. Routledge (1995:194-195) rightly notes that God does indeed look for דִּקְוָה in his people (cf. Hs 6:4, 6; Jr 2:2) towards himself, but this means human loyalty and devotion to God and faithfulness and obedience to his commandments, as well as faithfulness towards other covenant members. When דִּקְוָה is exhibited by God towards humans, there is an ‘extraordinary emphasis ... on the element of divine mercy, grace, and forbearance,’ and on his readiness to forgive (Zobel 1986:63). In covenant contexts, the element of loyalty is included in the term (Zobel 1986:61).⁶⁵

In Daniel 9:4, as in Deuteronomy 7:9, God is the ‘keeper of the covenant and the דִּקְוָה to those who love him and keep his commandments.’ In other words, a reciprocal relationship is in view. God keeps covenant and דִּקְוָה; mankind loves God and keeps his commandments. But, as the remainder of the prayer makes clear, God never breaks his side of the bargain, whereas human beings are prone to abandon theirs.

The word אָהַב (love) is also often used with covenant connotations, and thus becomes a legal term (Buchanan 1999:269; cf. also Kline 1974:456). Moran (1963:79) has shown that the use of the word ‘love’ in secular ANE treaties goes back to the second millennium BCE (he cites the Amarna letters), but is also continued in first century BCE

⁶⁵ Both דִּקְוָה and אָהַב appear a few times in the HB. In 1 Sm 20:8 David asks Jonathan to deal kindly (דִּקְוָה) with him because Jonathan had made David enter בְּבְרִיתָהּ with him. In the synonymous parallelism of Psalm 89:29 (Eng. v. 28) Yahweh affirms that he will keep his דִּקְוָה forever and his בְּרִית to David will be established. (cf. also Ps 106:45). Zobel (1986:60) states that in these two psalms ‘*hesed*’ functions as the content of the *bʿrīt*,’ but I think it is even more than that: in these verses the two terms are considered one and the same concept. This also applies to Isaiah 54:10 where the word is again used in the same breath as covenant in a parallel structure that equates דִּקְוָה and בְּרִית. In Isaiah 55:3 a similar construction equates אָהַב with בְּרִית עוֹלָם. In these contexts דִּקְוָה is obviously a covenant word, referring to the durability, faithfulness and loyalty of God and his promises, as indicated by the expression ‘everlasting covenant’ in Isaiah 55:3 (cf. Watts 1987:246 on 55:3) and the context in 54:10 (‘will not be removed from you/shaken’).

As such, '[e]thically speaking, sin is missing God's mark or goal of holy living that is required for human beings. Israel as a nation had fallen short of God's design to be a holy people' (Miller 1994:245).

The verb עָוָה conveys the idea of having committed an offence against God. Lucas (2002:237) suggests the translation 'go astray' and notes that the word is similar in meaning to חָטָא.⁶⁷ In the present context, the 'one who sins has veered from the straight and narrow road and "made his paths crooked",' which is even more serious since it is a deliberate action against God (Miller 1994:245).

The third word in Daniel's list of vices is רָשַׁע, which means 'to act wickedly', regardless of the verbal stem. It 'denotes the negative behavior of evil thoughts, words and deeds, a behavior not only contrary to God's character, but also hostile to the community and which at the same time betrays the inner disharmony and unrest of a man' (Livingston 1999:863).⁶⁸ Wood (1973:236) suggests that it also conveys the idea of deliberateness.⁶⁹

The word מָרַד is consistently translated 'rebel' (NASB), i.e. it conveys the idea of refusing to accept the authority of another (in particular a superior, ruler/king or God) and actively working against it. It only occurs in Daniel 9:5, 9 where it refers to the people of God refusing to accept the authority and sovereignty of Yahweh their God.⁷⁰

The last word in Daniel's list of vices, סָוֵר, means 'to remove, put away, take off' (e.g. Gn 8:13, Hiphil) or 'to turn aside, depart' (e.g. Gn 19:2, Qal). In the present context, it is a Qal infinitive absolute, in contrast to the preceding verbs which are all 1cp perfects. The word stresses Israel's apostasy from God which she effected by 'turning away' from his 'commandments and ordinances' (NASB; וּמִמְצֻוֹתָי וּמִמִּשְׁפָּטַי), instead of keeping them (cf. Rosscup 1992:59). Wood (1973:236) insightfully observes that the infinitive form of this verb indicates that it is 'not parallel' to the other four, but 'gives the basic reason for them' (cf. also Miller 1994).⁷¹

⁶⁷ Schultz (1999:650) opines that the root עוה has a basic meaning of 'twist, bend, distort,' hence 'to distort, to make crooked, to pervert,' and suggests that '[w]hen the distortion pertains to law it means "to sin, to infract, to commit a perversion/iniquity."'

⁶⁸ Livingston (1999:863) adds that the 'wicked' follow 'a lifestyle contrary to the laws of God' (as for example in the two references in Dn 11:32 and 12:10) but that this can be reversed by repentance and confession, as in Daniel 9:5.

⁶⁹ Goldingay (1991:250) notes that רשע is the antonym of צדק, to do right; it is a forensic term that 'indicates action that puts a person in the wrong in a legal or quasi-legal setting.' In Daniel 11:32 it is used in a covenant setting (see below).

⁷⁰ Elsewhere the word can refer to the rebellion of a subject people (i.e. Judah and her king) against their suzerain (the kings of Assyria or Babylon), e.g. in Isaiah 36:5 or in Jeremiah 52:3.

⁷¹ Walvoord (1971:207), quoting Stuart (1850:258), notes that the variety of verbs used to describe Israel's sin in this verse 'indicates the design of the speaker to confess all sin of every kind in its full extent.'

Israel has turned away from God's 'מִצְוֹת,' i.e. the covenant stipulations of the Lord (at Mt Sinai), which 'express his will' and which 'those who are committed to him ... obey' (Lucas 2002:237). They have also moved away from his מִשְׁפָּטִים, his 'judgments,' i.e. God's rules and ordinances. The word perhaps implies the exact way such rules are to be observed⁷² (cf. Enns 1997:1143). However, Israel has failed to comply with these regulations, which is the reason why they are now being disciplined in exile.

In summary, Daniel 9:5 is replete with covenant terminology, which is not surprising considering its relationship to deuteronomic literature. Most of these terms only occur in chapter 9 of Daniel, and in this chapter most of them only occur in the prayer (though there are notable exceptions, as will be seen in the discussion of Daniel 9:20-27). Lucas (2002:237) suggests that the words הִצְוָה and טָשַׁף are used more or less synonymously, though if a difference in nuance is included, it is that the former term 'refers more often to divine than to human commands' whereas 'the latter refers in particular to the responsibilities of kings and judges to administer justice.' This makes a good connection to the following verse.

2.3.2.2.2.3 *Daniel 9:6*

Daniel 9:6 describes the people's culpability by outlining how their transgressions were manifested in their lives. The initial ו conjunction may be translated 'and' (Goldingay 1991:225) or 'moreover' (NASB). The point is that not only have the people done all the things listed in verse 5, but they have added to their sins by refusing 'to listen to your servants, the prophets, who spoke in your name.' Probably Daniel thought of Jeremiah, whose writings he had been studying (cf. Greidanus 2012:287, who rightly notes that Daniel's 'prayer is filled with allusions to the book of Jeremiah') and who made the same accusation on numerous occasions.⁷³

⁷² Goldingay (1991:244-45) suggests that the underlying idea of the word טָשַׁף 'is the exercise of authority, on behalf of what is right and against what is wrong.' Thus he argues that מִשְׁפָּטִים 'are ... authoritative declarations concerning the kind of behaviour that is acceptable and the kind that is not' and that the word may refer to specific enactments, but it may also be used more generally for 'the authoritative commands that belong to the covenant' (Goldingay 1991:245).

⁷³ E.g. 7:25; 25:3-7; 26:4-6; 29:18-19; 35:15; 37:2; 44:4-6; cf. also Zechariah 1:4-6; 7:12-14; 2 Chronicles 24:19; 36:15-16; cf. also Hosea 6:5; Amos 2:11-12, 13-16. Steinmann (2008:437) observes that 'Jeremiah describes the prophets as God's "servants" more often than any other OT Book.' In postexilic literature, Ezra 9:10-11 states that the Lord used the prophets to teach his people his commandments, but they refused to listen to them. Nehemiah 9:26 goes a step further and indicts the people not only with refusing to listen to the prophets (as in Neh 9:30), but also with killing them when they tried to bring them back to Yahweh. Thus Daniel is in good company with his statement. The connection with deuteronomic language is also clear: Deuteronomy 18:19 warns that those who refuse to listen to God's prophets would be held to account, and one reason for the exile of the Northern Kingdom is that the people *refused to listen to the prophets*, continued in their rebellion against the Lord, and did not accept any warnings of coming judgment (1 Ki 17:13-14).

Daniel goes on to indict both the leaders and the people with refusing to listen to the prophetic message of repentance. The leaders are the kings (מְלָכִים), i.e. the highest political rulers, ‘princes’ (צְרִיפִים), a general term for a person in authority (either political, judicial or military; cf. Lucas 2002:238), and the ‘fathers’ (אֲבוֹתָם),⁷⁴ i.e. ‘those who had authority in the local community by virtue of their seniority within an extended family group’ (Lucas 2002:238; cf. Koch 1984:104, who notes they are probably the heads of the extended families/clans who together represented the people).⁷⁵

Some scholars comment on the fact that the list of culpable people excludes the (false) prophets and priests from the blame. Towner (1984:131-32) for example argues that in contrast to 1 Kings 8 where the king is the one interceding for the people and teaching them how to repent, Daniel (just as Nehemiah 9, Neh 9:34-35) indicts the king along with others and includes him in the culpability for the dire straits the nation is in. He suggests that the exclusion of the prophets from the list of culpable people is due to the fact that the ‘hierocratic circles’ in which Nehemiah and Daniel worked ‘may have been [nervous] about prophets,’ which is why they were included ‘among the righteous sufferers,’ rather than the sinners. Lacocque (1979:183) opines that the expression ‘those who are near’ in verse 7 indicates that the author of verses 6-7 must have been ‘in Jerusalem, not in Babylon or Susa’ since ‘[o]nly a Judean author could simply affirm that the dispersion (important because it concerned several countries) was a divine punishment. *This also accounts for the absence of priests and prophets from the guilty social classes*’ (italics his). However, I think this overstates the point. It is not at all certain that *only* a Judean author could affirm that the dispersion was a divine punishment. The possibility of dispersion is a threat even in the earliest prophets. Furthermore, it is not clear either that this accounts for the absence of the priests and prophets from the guilty classes. The fact that Daniel is praying as a result of his meditation on Jeremiah’s prophecies seems to indicate that though he does not mention the failure of the priests and (false) prophets here, he would have been aware of Jeremiah’s polemic against them. Therefore there may not be any significance in the omission of the priests and prophets in this verse. Moreover, if a second century dating or edition for this chapter is assumed, it is rather inexplicable why the writer/editor did not mention the failure of the priests since some of them were implicated

⁷⁴ The word ‘*’ab* may designate any man who occupies a position or receives recognition similar to that of a father,’ such as a person protecting the poor (Jb 29:16) or even an advisor to a king/Pharaoh (Gn 45:8) (Payne 1999:5). It can also be used generally for someone in authority, such as the leader of a prophetic group (2 Ki 6:21), a priest (Jdg 18:19) or a king (1 Sm 24:12 [Eng. 11]), as well as a grandfather or more distant ancestor (Payne 1999:5; cf. also Jenni 1997:1-13).

⁷⁵ Porteous (1979:137) suggests that there may be a point in arguing that the different classes are listed in descending order in the present verse. This is possible.

in the atrocities that were happening during the persecution of Antiochus IV. This may be another point in favour of an earlier dating of at least this part of the book.

2.3.2.2.2.4 *Daniel 9:7*

Daniel 9:7 begins with a series of verbless clauses contrasting the righteousness⁷⁶ of Yahweh (in an emphatic position; cf. Miller 1994:246) with the unfaithfulness of the people of Israel and Judah, because of which they had been scattered among the nations. It is significant that the word *תְּדָרָה* appears here with the definite article: ‘Yours, o Lord, is *the* righteousness’ (my translation) which is contrasted with the ‘shame of *the* face’ (also with the definite article), i.e. public disgrace (*בְּשֵׁת הַפְּנִיּוֹת*),⁷⁷ that is Israel’s lot. At first sight, this seems to be simply noting one of the attributes of God: he is ‘righteous.’ However, in the context of the verse Daniel also mentions that it was God who had caused the Israelites to be dispersed all over the world because of their unfaithfulness, and in accordance with covenant law (cf. Collins 1993:350). Therefore, the word here not only implies an attribute of God, but also refers to his ‘righteous’ acts or ‘justice’ in dealing with his people.

‘Us’ is further defined by the addition of the phrases ‘the men of Judah’ (i.e. the southern Kingdom), ‘the inhabitants of Jerusalem’ and ‘all Israel’ (i.e. the northern Kingdom, or perhaps both southern and northern kingdom combined), both ‘those nearby’ and ‘those far away in all the lands where you scattered them because of all their unfaithfulness which they committed against you’ (cf. Keil & Delitzsch 1996:713; cf. Jr 16:15; 23:3, 8; 32:37, as per Steinmann 2008:438). In other words, everyone is culpable; no one is exempt.⁷⁸ If a Babylonian setting for the prayer is assumed, perhaps the ‘nearby’ refers to the exiles of the southern kingdom (Judah) and the ‘far away’ to the exile of the

⁷⁶ The word here is the feminine *תְּדָרָה* (occurring in Dn 9:7, 16, 18) rather than the masculine *תְּדָרָה* (occurring in Dn 9:24), but there is no difference in meaning (Stigers 1999:752). Generally *תְּדָרָה* refers to that which conforms ‘to an ethical or moral standard’ or norm which in the Bible is ‘the nature and will of God’ (Stigers 1999:752; cf. Reimer 1997:746), which includes such things as ‘just’ weights and measures (Lv 19:36; Dt 25:15). In the forensic sense the words have to do ‘with the adjudication or declaration of right behaviour or status’ (Reimer 1997:746), and theologically, they express ‘something true about God’ (Reimer 1997:746). Reimer (1997:750) believes that ‘covenant [is never] invoked [explicitly] as a ground or basis’ for *תְּדָרָה*, but I beg to differ. While covenant may not be invoked explicitly as a basis for *תְּדָרָה*, the idea is nevertheless there. Both *תְּדָרָה* and *תְּדָרָה* are used in Deuteronomy, which is a covenant renewal document (cf. Dt 6:25; 16:20). Therefore Stigers’ position that in the Bible the standard that *תְּדָרָה* and *תְּדָרָה* refer to is the laws and commandments of God is preferable.

⁷⁷ The Hebrew idea of *בֹּשֶׁת* is “‘to come to shame” and stresses the sense of public disgrace’ (Oswalt 1999:97); in Daniel 9:7 the disgrace results from defeat by an enemy (Oswalt 1999:98). *בֹּשֶׁת* ‘always has to do with a negative condition or experience as a result of a relationship in which perceived codes of conduct, honor, position, or expectations are not fully met or are violated’ (Nel 1997:626). This admirably suits the present context where Yahweh’s *תְּדָרָה*, i.e. his ‘righteous acts’ which are always in conformity with his own standard, are contrasted with Israel’s failure to live up to those same standards that result in her *בְּשֵׁת הַפְּנִיּוֹת*.

⁷⁸ Lucas (2002:238) rightly suggests that the explicit mention of “‘all Israel” here and in v. 11, and also “Israel” in v. 20, makes the theological claim that despite all that has happened, the covenant community that originated from Jacob/Israel and took shape at Sinai still exists, though now scattered.’ Walvoord (1971:208) observes that the scattering of the people throughout “‘all the countries where thou hast driven them,” was not occasioned by one sin, but by generation after generation of failure to obey the Law or to give heed to the prophets.’

northern kingdom (Israel) a century earlier. If a second century setting is assumed, ‘those nearby’ is probably a reference to the happenings in Judea during the Maccabean wars, whereas those ‘far away’ may refer to Jews elsewhere.

The specific reference to the inhabitants of Jerusalem who are particularly involved in the nation’s sin (cf. Wood 1973:237), and the phrase ‘unfaithful deeds’ (NASB; אֲשֶׁר מָעַלְוּ-בָּךְ; ⁷⁹בְּמַעַלְוֹת) which refers back to the list of sins in vv. 5-6, recalls Ezekiel 8-11 where Jerusalem is indicted for its idolatry. In the OT Jerusalem is the city of the Lord, the place where God revealed himself to his people, the place where he chose to dwell (Goldingay 1991:248). It is the city ‘that bears Yahweh’s name – that is, the city he owns,’ as Daniel stresses (Goldingay 1991:248). But the inhabitants have not lived up to their high calling.

2.3.2.2.2.5 Daniel 9:8-9

Verse 8 begins with a direct address to YHWH: ‘O Lord, to us belong shame of face.’ The list of people indicted in verse 6 is repeated, denoting all types of social classes, and making the same point: all are guilty; none are innocent (cf. Walvoord 1971:208). Wood (1973:238) is probably right in thinking that the two titles for God in verses 7-8 connote authority (אֲדֹנָי) and grace (יְהוָה) respectively.

Verse 9a lists more positive attributes of God, which are contrasted with more of the negative traits of the people in the rest of verse 9 and verse 10. In each case, the previous list is continued and complemented. There is a change here from the first person address of Daniel to God to third-person statements about God, a literary feature also known from the Psalms. Walvoord (1971:208-209) suggests that Daniel thus seems to ‘state a truth for all who will hear, a theological fact now being introduced as the basis for the remainder of the prayer.’ Perhaps verses 8-9 could be translated: ‘O Yahweh, to us, to our kings, to our leaders, to our fathers, belong the shamefacedness [with] which we have sinned against you, our compassionate and forgiving Lord God, for we have rebelled against him.’ God is again addressed as ‘Lord, *our* God’ (אֲדֹנָי אֱלֹהֵינוּ). He is still Israel’s God, despite all their failings. He is a God of compassion (הַרְחֵמֵם) who is willing to forgive (הַסְּלִיחֹת), or, more literally the God of *the* compassions and *the* forgivenesses (both

⁷⁹ The word מעל indicates ‘the breaking or violation of religious law as a conscious act of treachery. The victim ... is [often, but not always] God’ (Hamilton 1999:519-520). In the prophetic literature, the word only occurs in Ezekiel and here (Hamilton 1999:519).

nouns are plural and definite).⁸⁰ Coppes (1999:842) notes that though God will punish Israel's sin by exiling her (Dt 30:3), her repentance would 'meet with God's tender compassion.' Perhaps this is the reason why Daniel uses the word here.⁸¹

2.3.2.2.2.6 *Daniel 9:10*

Verse 10 continues by reiterating what has already been stated in verse 6, namely that Israel has not 'listened to/obeyed the voice of Yahweh our God,' which was audible through his 'laws' or 'teachings' (NASB; תּוֹרָתוֹ) and was given through the intermediation (lit. 'by the hand') of 'his servants the prophets.' In covenant contexts, such as here in Daniel 9:10, Torah refers to the stipulations of the covenant (either in part or as a whole), in particular Moses' instructions to the people at Mt Sinai (cf. Dt 1:5; Hartley 1999:404).⁸² According to Deuteronomy 18, Moses is the model prophet. Therefore the reference in Daniel 9:10 to the instructions through the *prophets* may be construed as instruction in the Mosaic law. But, as Daniel is only too aware, Israel had neither heeded the instruction of the prophets, nor had they 'walked in [Yahweh's] ways.' The importance of walking in God's ways is emphasised e.g. in Leviticus 26:3 ('if you will walk in my statutes...') where the conditional clause precedes promises of blessing (cf. also Dt 28:9). God's blessings are not unconditional; in order to receive them, God's people must obey his voice and walk in his ways and statutes (cf. Lv 26, Dt 28). If they fail to do so, a long list of curses outlines the disasters that will overcome Israel instead of the desired blessings.

⁸⁰ Hill (2008:165) observes that the plurals 'are intensive and have the effect of "emphasizing God's great and manifold 'mercies' and his abundant forgiveness'" (quoting Miller 1994:246). Others suggest it means 'acts of forgiveness' (Goldingay 1991:227) or that it conveys the idea of 'the continued and extended exercise of [the] qualities or attributes' of רַחֲמִים and סְלִיחָה (Young 1949:186). Lucas (2002:238) suggests that הַסְּלִיחוֹת is an intensive plural denoting 'abundant forgiveness' (cf. BDB), and observes that 'Yahweh's compassion is not simply an emotion. It results in action. In this case the action is forgiveness, despite Israel's rebellion' (cf. also Goldingay 1991:243-44 on רַחֲמִים).

⁸¹ Butterworth (1997:1094) suggests that the word רַחֲמִים 'signifies warm compassion, a compassion which goes the second mile, which is ready to forgive sin, to replace judgment with grace.' This suits the context of the verse admirably, in particular since 'forgiveness' is explicitly mentioned. The verb from which 'forgiveness' is derived is only used with God as subject and denotes his offer of forgiveness and pardon for human sin (Kaiser 1999:626; cf. Olivier 1997:260).

⁸² The basic meaning seems to be 'teaching' (cf. Hartley 1999:403; Enns 1997:897), whether by humans or by God. Generally תּוֹרָה 'designates some divine standard of conduct for God's people,' and includes cultic, social and civil laws (Enns 1997:893). Hosea 8:1 even appears to equate 'covenant' with 'law': 'they have transgressed *my covenant* and against *my law* they rebelled' (עָבְרוּ בְרִיתִי וְעַל-תּוֹרָתִי פָּשְׁעוּ). The teaching of *tōrā* 'was entrusted to the priests and scribes,' but also the prophets if priests and scribes failed to perform their duty adequately (Enns 1997:893). Apart from 'specific legal or moral instruction,' *tōrā* also includes 'a historical review of Israel's past,' and from the postbiblical period onwards it referred to 'the Pentateuch as a whole [as the] divine instruction book for godly living' (Enns 1997:897).

2.3.2.2.7 Daniel 9:11

Daniel 9:11 continues with the third person account of Israel's sins, but soon changes again to second person address. Daniel reiterates that 'all Israel'⁸³ have 'sinned [by] transgressing your law' (וְכָל־יִשְׂרָאֵל עָבְרוּ אֶת־תּוֹרַתְךָ), and specifies this as 'that which is written in the instruction of Moses, the servant of God, that we have sinned against' (my translation). The word עבר can have covenant overtones, and in that case is most frequently used to express the violation of the covenant relationship (Harman 1997:315).⁸⁴ In the next phrase Daniel describes the sin of Israel in terms that he has already used before: they have transgressed God's law by 'turning aside' (סור) and 'not listening to/not obeying [Yahweh's] voice' (לְבַלְתִּי שְׁמוֹעַ בְּקוֹלְךָ).

The rest of the verse gives the result of Israel's sin. Because of their transgression and refusal to obey Yahweh, he 'poured out' (וַתִּתֵּן) upon them 'the curse' (הַקְּלָה) and 'the oath' (וְהַשְּׁבָעָה); both words are singular and definite)⁸⁵ 'which is written in the law of Moses the servant of God' (NASB). Both these words are important in relation to covenant. The order in which they are used in this verse is also significant: God poured out his *curse*, according to his *oath* in the covenant promises, which is heavily reminiscent of Deuteronomy 28 and Leviticus 26 (cf. Miller 1994:247). However, it is interesting that neither אָלָה nor שְׁבָעָה occurs in these chapters, though I would argue that the idea is nonetheless present. Both chapters not only refer to covenant sanctions such as crop failure and famine, but also to the expulsion from the land as the ultimate penalty for falling away from worshipping Yahweh. Deuteronomy 29 reports the covenant renewal ceremony at the brink of Israel's entry into the Promised Land, and there both the noun אָלָה and the verb שְׁבָעָה occur.⁸⁶

⁸³ Goldingay (1991:246) points out that the 'Judeans ... saw themselves as the preserved remnant of that whole people of God, and thus came to apply the name "Israel" to themselves.' Therefore, 'to speak of Israel ... is to make a significant theological claim for the little community of Judeans who survived the exile, by seeing them as the successors of that whole people with whom Yahweh entered into covenant (vv. 11, 20)' (Goldingay 1991:246). The Chronicler characteristically portrays 'all Israel' as taking part in such significant events as 'making David and Solomon king, bringing up the ark, and dedicating the temple.' Moreover, in the present context, the unity of 'all Israel' 'is a unity in wrongdoing' (Goldingay 1991:247). But like the Chronicler, Daniel too sees the surviving remnant in exile as the representatives of a much larger whole that he calls Israel.

⁸⁴ This word will be discussed in more detail in the section on the Dead Sea Scrolls.

⁸⁵ According to Kottsieper (2004:334) the two words form a hendiadys which 'refers to the curses that according to Deuteronomy accompanied the covenant at Horeb (Dt. 28:15-68; 30:17-19; cf. Towner 1984:133; Porteous 1965:138, who also mentions Dt 29:18ff).'

⁸⁶ Goldingay (1991:251) observes that אָלָה 'does not denote an imprecation, but a sanction imposed in the name of legal rights or religio-ethical demands.' He goes on to suggest that the fact that the calamity of Israel is explained in terms of אָלָה and שְׁבָעָה 'is to exclude [their] explanation ... in terms of chance or of the demonic' (Goldingay 1991:251-52), though not excluding the supernatural (he calls it 'magical'). In fact, the calamity comes as a judgment by Yahweh who deliberately brought it about as part of his 'predetermined plan' (Goldingay 1991:252).

2.3.2.2.2.8 Daniel 9:12

Verse 12 begins with the clause *וַיִּקְּם אֶת־דְּבָרָיו*, ‘and he *established* his word,’ using a verb that often indicates the ‘establishing’ of a covenant (e.g. Gn 17:7).⁸⁷ Deuteronomy 9:5 states that God will establish his *word* (דְּבָר, i.e. promise) to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.⁸⁸ This is meant here, too, though ‘word’ now refers to a threat (cf. Goldingay 1991:245) ‘against us and against our rulers (שֹׁפְטֵי) who ruled over us’ (NASB) through the law of Moses (v. 13) and the prophets (v. 10). Since the people refused to listen, from the greatest (rulers, שֹׁפְטֵי)⁸⁹ to the least (the common people, עַם, ‘us’), the result was the judgment of destruction on their city and land and exile for many of their people.

In Daniel 9:4 God is called the ‘שֹׁמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד.’ In the present verse, Daniel reiterates that God keeps his covenant, but by ‘establishing’ it with regard to its curses: just as God is faithful in bringing about his promises of blessing and salvation, he is also faithful in bringing about his threats of punishment and disaster if necessary (cf. Ne 9:8; Dt 9:8; Lacocque 1979:183; Hill 2008:165). Daniel particularly mentions the judgment on Jerusalem,⁹⁰ harking back to the prophecies of Isaiah (Is 3:1-4:1; 10:11), Jeremiah (e.g. Jr 7; 35:17; 36:31 etc.) and Ezekiel (esp. Ezk 8-11) that pronounce doom on the city because of all her sins, especially idolatry. Yet these prophets also saw beyond that time of punishment and preached restoration after judgment had run its course (e.g. Is 2:2-4; 4:4-6 etc.; Jr 30- 33; Ezk 40-41).

Nonetheless, when the downfall came, it was a great shock to the people. Daniel is not the only one who calls it ‘a great calamity’ (רָעָה גְדוֹלָה) or simply a ‘calamity’ that the Lord had brought upon her (cf. Jr 16:10; 32:42). The book of Lamentations gives expression to the feelings of despair that overwhelmed the people at the destruction of Jerusalem, though in different terms.

Those scholars who see in this prayer a reference to the desecration of Antiochus Epiphanes point out that the disaster here refers to the experience of ‘plundering, pillaging, suppression, and murder’ under that infamous king’s rule (Anderson 1984:108-109). Obviously the Jews living in that era would have found in this prayer much they could

⁸⁷ Genesis 6:18; 9:9, 11, 17; 17:7, 19, 21; 26:3 (cf. Jr 11 :5); Exodus 6:4; Leviticus 26:9; Deuteronomy 8:18; 2 Kings 23:3; Ezekiel 16:60, 62.

⁸⁸ Cf. also 1 Samuel 1:23; 2 Samuel 7:25; 1 Kings 2:4; 6:12; 8:20; 12:15; Jeremiah 29:10; 33:14.

⁸⁹ The word שֹׁפְטֵי adds to the list of rulers listed in verses 6 to 8. It implies more than mere judicial capacities, but includes general rule. In the present context, it seems to be used as a summary term for all the leaders, both secular and religious, listed previously in verses 6 and 8 (cf. Montgomery 1927:365; Young 1949:187).

⁹⁰ The statement that ‘under the whole heaven there has not been done *anything* like what was done to Jerusalem’ (NASB) sounds odd since other cities too were captured and destroyed by the Babylonians and their inhabitants taken into captivity (cf. Miller 1994:247), but it should be read in the context of the significance of Jerusalem as the city of Israel’s God and the fact that the Israelites thought their city impenetrable because of the protection of her God.

identify with, but I believe that the immediate context in Daniel 9 and the similarity of the prayer to those of Ezra and Nehemiah indicates rather the destruction of both Jerusalem and temple in 587/6 BC. Seow (2003:144) seems to admit as much since he argues that ‘Daniel’s prayer ... recontextualizes Deuteronomistic theology ... so that it applies not only to the distraught exiles of the sixth century ... but also to the Jews of the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, in the second century.’ He further notes that the first person application of the prayer is ‘particularly poignant: the prayer is not about those in the past, but about “us” – those to whom the book of Daniel is addressed. In this way ... the narrator is able to maintain the historical stage in which the book is set – namely the sixth century B.C.E. – while addressing the concerns of people who lived long after that time’ (Seow 2003:144). He further notes that the description of the fall of Jerusalem as “‘a calamity so great that what has been done against Jerusalem has never before been done under the whole heaven” ... is certainly appropriate as a characterization of the devastation under Antiochus IV Epiphanes in 167 B.C.E.’ (Seow 2003:145).

2.3.2.2.2.9 *Daniel 9:13*

Verse 13 continues the thought of verse 12 by noting that the ‘great calamity,’ i.e. the fall of Jerusalem, had been written about already in the ‘law of Moses’ (כְּתוּב בְּתוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה), probably a reference to Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28 and 29. Yet despite all this, Daniel realizes that the people as a whole had failed to ‘appease’ (הִלִּינוּ) God’s face, i.e. to ‘smooth’⁹¹ out the wrinkles of disapproval from God’s face by seeking his favour (Gesenius 2003b:279) through turning (שׁוּב)⁹² from iniquity and seeking Yahweh’s truth.

Daniel acknowledges Israel’s lack of true repentance, even in the face of the calamity of the exile. Not only had the people not turned away from their iniquities, they also refused to gain ‘insight into’ or ‘show devotion for’ (שָׁכַל, HALOT, meaning 5) Yahweh’s truth (אֱמֶת).

Gaining insight (שָׁכַל) is an important concept in Daniel. Daniel ‘perceived’ or ‘understood’ (בִּיָּן) from reading the books God’s purposes (Dn 9:2). Chapters 1-6 emphasize how Daniel and his three friends have more insight and understanding than

⁹¹ Cf. BDB and Gesenius (2003b:279), who suggest that the word comes from a root meaning to ‘rub’ the face, hence to ‘smooth’ it. Swanson (1997) suggests the meaning ‘ask a request of another, with the focus as a positive, humble request with no commanding or demanding’ for הָלָה, and thus it is another word for prayer (cf. Stolz 1997:427; Weber 1997:287).

⁹² שׁוּב is the most common term to express the idea of turning either to or away from God (or idols; cf. Thompson & Martens 1997:56), and is a favoured term in Jeremiah. It may have the sense of ‘defection’ or ‘shifting loyalties,’ especially ‘a shift in one’s spiritual position,’ and in this sense it is a covenant term (cf. HALOT, meaning 10; Hamilton 1997:909; Thompson & Martens 1997:57). In Daniel 9:13 the word is used with the meaning ‘turn away’ from wickedness (עוֹן) and, impliedly, ‘to’ God.

anyone else, and particularly how Daniel is able to interpret the dreams and visions of the Babylonian kings (chs. 2, 4, 5). In chapters 7-12 the writer mentions several times Daniel's desire to gain insight and understanding (7:16; 8:5, 15,17; 10:1, 10, 12, 14; all using בִּין), or points out that people having insight (מְשֻׁכְּלִים) will understand and be able to teach others (11:33, 35; 12:3, 10). Daniel uses the verb שָׁכַל more than any other book except Proverbs and Psalms.⁹³ The word can convey the sense of 'comprehending something,' and it is possible 'to distinguish the aspects of "acquiring knowledge," ... "possessing knowledge" ... and "transmitting knowledge"' (Koenen 2004:117). Goldberg (1999:877) notes that שָׁכַל is more or less synonymous with the terms 'wisdom' (חָכְמָה) and 'understanding' (בִּין), but 'there is a fine distinction. While *bîn* indicates "distinguishing between," *śākal* relates to an *intelligent knowledge* of the reason.' In other words, שָׁכַל indicates a 'process of *thinking through* a complex arrangement of thoughts resulting in a wise dealing and use of good practical common sense' (Goldberg 1999:877; emphasis added).⁹⁴

In Daniel 1 and 11-12 the derived noun מְשֻׁכְּלִים is used, always in the plural, and referring to people who are wise and have insight to understand the signs of the times. In Daniel 1:4 it is used of those Jews, like Daniel and his three friends, whom Nebuchadnezzar chose to receive a Babylonian education and to serve at his court. These מְשֻׁכְּלִים are people who not only have wisdom and insight themselves, but are able to live accordingly and pass on their knowledge to others.⁹⁵

In Daniel 9:13, שָׁכַל is used with the meaning 'act in a manner that shows wisdom and understanding in right living.' Daniel admits that the Israelites have failed to act in a manner that shows regard for the *truth* (אֱמֻנָה) of Yahweh by refusing to turn from their deliberate sin. NASB translates אֱמֻנָה here 'truth,' but perhaps the idea of 'faithfulness' is also implied, considering the fact that Daniel was looking at God's covenant faithfulness

⁹³ The main meanings are: 1. Be successful or prosperous (materially as well as spiritually); 2. Act in a manner that shows wisdom and understanding in right living; 3. Speak in a way that exhibits wisdom or teach others in such behaviour. Swanson (1997) suggests for Daniel 9 the meaning 'give attention, have regard, act with care, give heed to, i.e., give thought for a person or situation, implying a proper response (... Da 9:13)' (italics added). Koenen (2004:117) believes that instead of a basic meaning, '[o]nly a semantic field ... can be determined for *śākal*,' and suggests that the verb may mean 'become insightful/reasonable' or 'be insightful/reasonable', whereby 'the focus is not primarily on any one, specific intellectual ability, but rather on the more general use of common sense.'

⁹⁴ Koenen (2004:117-118) notes in this context that שָׁכַל is often used in connection with the just mentioned roots when it means 'comprehend something' or 'have insight.' In Deuteronomy 29:8 it appears together with the word בְּרִית: 'Keep the words of this covenant (בְּרִית) and do them, so you may prosper (תִּשְׁכַּל) in all that you do.' Success (or possibly understanding) comes from covenant obedience; hence the concept is important also in covenant contexts even where the word does not appear.

⁹⁵ Koenen (2004:115) notes that the 'participle describes how a reasonable or successful person acts and fares.' He also remarks that in Daniel 11-12 the reference is to persons who are loyal to God, and who are thus described as having insight. He suggests that they could be described as "an extreme eschatological group within the Hasideans" with whom the author identifies (Koenen 2004:116, quoting Plöger 1965:165).

in bringing about the judgments he had. In other words, there is a stark contrast between God and Israel.

2.3.2.2.2.10 *Daniel 9:14*

The end of verse 13 noted that Israel failed to ‘give attention’ (NASB) to God’s truth. Verse 14 begins by noting that in contrast to Israel’s failure to give attention or to regard God’s truth, Yahweh has made sure that the disaster that he had for a long time announced to them was indeed taking effect. The word used is *שָׁקַד*, the same word that appears in Jeremiah 1:12 where God says that he is ‘watching over’ his word in order to perform it. Here it apparently means ‘to not hesitate, i.e. ... be set to take action’ (Swanson 1997), in a deliberate contrast to Israel’s failure to pay careful attention to God’s *אֱמֶת*. Unlike them, God is always faithful to his word and character. He had promised them blessings in case of their obedience, as well as curses in case of their disobedience. Since they failed to obey, the curses were now operative. Daniel accepts God’s action in judgment as ‘righteous’ (*צַדִּיק*) ‘with respect to all His deeds which He has done’ (NASB). In other words, God has not acted unfairly by judging the people; they got what they deserved because they had been disobedient (*וְלֹא שָׁמְעוּ בְּקוֹלוֹ*) as noted already repeatedly in the prayer (cf. vv. 10, 11).

2.3.2.2.2.11 *Daniel 9:15*

The contrastive ‘but now’ (*וְעַתָּה*) at the beginning of verse 15 indicates that a new section begins here. Daniel returns to the second person address (*אֲדֹנָי אֱלֹהֵינוּ*, ‘O Yahweh *our* God’) and continues to confess the sins of the people. Like Jeremiah (32:20-21; which he follows almost verbatim, cf. Steinmann 2008:440) Daniel refers to God’s deliverance of his people from Egypt (*אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתָ אֶת-עַמְּךָ מִמִּצְרַיִם בְּיַד חֲזָקָה*), through which he had made for himself ‘a name’ (NASB; *וַתַּעַשׂ-לְךָ שֵׁם*), i.e. a reputation as a God who is mighty to deliver the helpless. Instead of being thankful to God, however, the people he had delivered continued to ‘sin’ (*חָטְאוּ*, ‘we sinned’) and ‘do wickedness’ (*רָשָׁעוּ*, ‘we have acted wickedly’), two words already used before in this prayer. Daniel’s reference to the great deliverance of the exodus from Egypt is then taken as a basis for his plea with Yahweh in the following verses. The argument is that he does not plead with God because of anything special done by the people, but purely because of God’s own character. The people, in fact, have done nothing to deserve God’s gracious dealings with them. Neither does God owe them deliverance (cf. Wood 1973:241). The punishment they are suffering at the present moment is fully deserved, and God could not be blamed if he decided to let the people

continue to suffer in exile (or under Antiochus Epiphanes, if this is accepted as the ultimate setting of the chapter). Miller (1994:248) rightly argues that Daniel was referring to the Exodus to remind Yahweh of his ‘role as the covenant-keeping God who delivered Israel from Egypt in order to fulfill his covenant promises to Abraham and to establish his reputation (“name”) among the nations.’

2.3.2.2.3 Daniel’s Plea for Mercy (9:16-19)

2.3.2.2.3.1 *Daniel 9:16*

So Daniel dares to plead for mercy on account of all of Yahweh’s ‘righteous acts’ (lit. ‘all your *righteousnesses*’, כְּכָל־צְדָקוֹתָיִךְ) or “just actions.” The point is that justice had been served. Israel had been punished for [her] sins, and now it would be right (“just”) for God to restore the nation (cf. Isa 40:2; Lev 26:41)’ (Miller 1994:248). Thus Daniel asks the Lord (יְיָ) to ‘turn’ from his anger (אֵרָא) and furious wrath (חֲרָה) against Jerusalem and his ‘holy mountain.’ The two words for anger and wrath ‘are close synonyms’ and used together in this verse ‘for emphasis’ (Wood 1973:241).

Daniel also uses the argument that ultimately Jerusalem and the temple had not been chosen by human beings, but by Yahweh himself as his dwelling place. The phrasing is reminiscent of Solomon’s prayer of dedication at the completion of the Temple and Yahweh’s answer to this prayer, and implicitly also to the Davidic covenant (cf. 1 Ki 9:3-9; 2 Chr 7:12-22).⁹⁶

Daniel is fully aware of the implications of these ancient threats. In the remainder of the verse he admits that Jerusalem and her inhabitants have become ‘a reproach’ (NASB) or an ‘object of scorn’ (NIV; חֲרָה)⁹⁷ to ‘all those surrounding’ them because of the sins and iniquities of the nation (אֲבוֹתֵינוּ, lit. ‘our fathers,’ i.e. all the predecessors of the present Israelites, not just clan leaders; cf. Lucas 2002:240). In the eyes of the Babylonian conquerors the exile of Israel and the destruction of their capital city and main temple showed that Yahweh had been too weak to protect his people and sanctuary, or was too capricious to care, but Daniel acknowledges that both exile and destruction were the result of Israel’s unfaithfulness towards God (cf. Wood 1973:241; Miller 1994:249).

⁹⁶ It is obvious from these scriptures that Yahweh had not dedicated himself to the temple unconditionally. In fact, his answer to Solomon’s prayer makes it clear that though he had chosen the city and temple for his name, he threatened to hand both over to their enemies if Israel ever turned away from worshipping him alone. In other words, this kind of defection would be treated as treason, and the punishment was framed in terms similar to those of the covenant curses in Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28, though of course adapted to the particular situation of the city and temple.

⁹⁷ McComiskey (1999:325) suggests that the connotation of this word always is ‘casting blame or scorn on someone.’

2.3.2.2.3.2 *Daniel 9:17*

Yet because of Yahweh's character, Daniel dares to put across his supplications on behalf of his people. He continues with the second person address to 'our God' (אֱלֹהֵינוּ). Despite the seriousness of their crimes and the harshness of the punishment, Israel is still Yahweh's own people. They are being chastised, but he has never abandoned them completely. Furthermore, Daniel prays and puts forward his supplications⁹⁸ not because of any merits of his own or because of anything his people have done, but because of God's character: 'for *your* sake, o Lord' (לְמַעַן אֲדַוְּךָ, lit. 'for the sake of the/my Lord'). In fact, he asks in terms reminiscent of the Aaronic blessing (cf. Selman 1997:324; Steinmann 2008:441) that Yahweh would again 'let his face shine upon' (וְהָאָר פָּנֶיךָ; Hiph impt) his desolate⁹⁹ sanctuary (עַל־מִקְדָּשְׁךָ הַשְּׁמָמָה). Lucas (2002:240) argues that 'one basis of the plea for mercy is the fact that Yahweh's reputation is bound up with the city and sanctuary since they bear his name,' and that this is why 'the exiles in Babylon were still deeply concerned about the state of affairs in Jerusalem,' as is evidenced also by such scriptures as Psalm 137 and Nehemiah 1. He continues to observe that the focus on Jerusalem and the temple in this section is sometimes seen as proof that this prayer 'must have been composed in Judea' or refer to the situation under Antiochus Epiphanes (Lucas 2002:240; cf. Anderson 1984:109). However, he contends, rightly in my opinion, that this need not necessarily be so, since 'there is a theological reason for this prominence.'

2.3.2.2.3.3 *Daniel 9:18*

The second-person plea to Yahweh continues in this verse. Daniel asks Yahweh to 'incline' his ear (Hiph impt ms נָטָה) and to 'hear' as well as 'open' his 'eyes and see' all their 'desolations (שְׁמָמֹתֵינוּ).' The phraseology is almost exactly the same as that in 2 Kings 19:16 (cf. Is 37:17; וְהָאָה וְרָאָה; cf. Steinmann 2008:441) where Hezekiah prays on the occasion of the Assyrian siege against Jerusalem. In that case, Hezekiah received a favourable answer from the Lord regarding the deliverance of the

⁹⁸ The words for 'prayer' and 'supplications' are the same as those in verse 3.

⁹⁹ The adjective 'desolate' in the expression 'your desolate sanctuary' (מִקְדָּשְׁךָ הַשְּׁמָמָה) only occurs twice in the HB, here and in Jeremiah 12:11. However, the root שָׁמַם occurs quite frequently. It has the connotation of 'the desolation caused by some great disaster, usually as a result of divine judgment' (Austel 1999:936). Lucas (2002:240) rightly argues that the use of the word in the present verse 'may be derived from the fact that the same root is used several times for the "desolation" of the land in the covenant curses in Lev. 26.' Therefore, apart from supplying a link with the next verse (18) and verse 27 later on in this chapter, this is another covenant connection, though a negative one.

city. Perhaps Daniel, hoping for a similar answer, uses a similar prayer. The language is that of an urgent plea.¹⁰⁰

On the basis of the fact that Jerusalem is Yahweh's city and the people his own, Daniel asks that Yahweh listen to his supplications and open his eyes to 'our desolations (שְׁמִמֹתֵינוּ) and the city that is *called by your name*.' The present verse is perhaps reminiscent of Jeremiah 25:29, which states that Yahweh would destroy the city that is called by his name. 'Being called by Yahweh's name' means a special relationship between God and the person or entity so labelled. Daniel, having meditated on the writings of Jeremiah in particular, reminds the Lord that Jerusalem is in a very special sense his own city and asks therefore that Yahweh would have mercy towards it and the temple as well as the people in it (Dn 9:19). Miller (1994:249) suggests that the expression 'our desolations' (שְׁמִמֹתֵינוּ) indicates 'that more than the devastation of Jerusalem was meant. All the calamities that had come upon the nation and its people were involved.' Others (e.g. Anderson 1984:109; Seow 2003:145¹⁰¹) see here a reference to the situation under Antiochus Epiphanes. Lacocque (1979:186) believes that the original reference was indeed to the destruction of the temple and city by Nebuchadnezzar, but that the second-century author of the book saw in it 'the profanation of the Temple by Antiochus.' He further observes that the 'theme of devastation recurs five times in this chapter (see vv. 18, 26, 27)' and that there 'is a crescendo in the movement up to v. 27 where the apex is attained with the mention of שְׁמִמֹתֵינוּ.' In Lacocque's opinion, this element was added to the prayer by the second century author.

Whichever actual historical situation is in view, the argument in either case is that Israel has no righteousness of her own and that her plea to Yahweh is based purely on his mercy. Daniel bases his prayer not on the basis of any merits (lit. righteousnesses; צְדָקָתֵינוּ) of the people or himself, which do not exist before Yahweh, but on Yahweh's 'great compassion' (רַחֲמֵיךָ הַגְּדוֹלִים).¹⁰² The expression 'present our supplication' is interesting: it is literally 'we let our supplications fall before you' (אֲנִיחֵנוּ מִפִּילֵים תְּהַנוּגֵנוּ) (

¹⁰⁰ The pointing of 'Please, open your eyes and see' (פָּקְחָה עֵינֶיךָ) is problematic: Ketiv and 4Q116 (4QDn^c) col. 2, frags. 3, col. ii:8 read פָּקְחָה (i.e. Qal impt 2ms + paragogic [emphatic] הֵ); Qere reads פָּקַח (simple Qal impt 2ms); the force is similar, though perhaps not as urgent as פָּקְחָה. Ketiv is perhaps to be preferred.

¹⁰¹ Seow (2003:145) notes that the 'reference to the temple in verse 17 as "your desolated sanctuary" is perhaps a deliberate allusion to Antiochus' rededication of the Jerusalem temple to Zeus Olympius, who was known as Baal Shamem (see 2 Macc. 6:2). The holy sanctuary has become desolated, *šāmēm*, indeed, replaced by one named *ba' l šāmēm*!

¹⁰² Lacocque (1979:186) notes that this expression 'appears frequently in liturgical passages' (he lists as examples among others 2 Sm 24:14; Ps 119:156), observes that the term רַחַם 'expresses a father's recognition of a newly born child as his own' and suggests that if it is used, as here, in a covenant framework, then 'the dominant nuance is that of forgiveness.'

לִפְנֵי), perhaps indicating Daniel's physical posture of humble prostration as he prays (cf. Goldingay 1991:252; Steinmann 2008:441).¹⁰³

2.3.2.2.3.4 *Daniel 9:19*

Daniel 9:19 concludes the prayer with 'a passionate crescendo' (Miller 1994:249). All the imperatives have emphatic endings. Daniel repeats the address 'o Lord' (יְיָ) three times to make his prayer more poignant. Walvoord (1971:212) notes that Daniel no longer uses the covenant name Yahweh in verses 15-19, but only the word יְיָ. He suggests that the significance of this fact may be that 'Daniel is recognizing God's absolute sovereignty over him as Lord.' Having presented all his arguments why God should listen to his prayer, he now pleads with him to 'listen' (שָׁמַע) and to 'forgive' (סָלַח). As noted above, סָלַח is only used with God as the subject in the OT, expressing 'God's offer of pardon and forgiveness to the sinner' (Kaiser 1999:626). Here it is the whole nation that has sinned and that therefore needs God's forgiveness. Furthermore, Daniel asks not just for forgiveness, but also for speedy action on behalf of his people. God is called to 'pay close attention to' (קָשַׁב) Daniel's prayer and 'to act' (עָשָׂה) speedily, i.e. without delay (אֲלֵ-תִּצְדָּק), because God's 'own reputation was at stake' (Miller 1994:249). As far as Daniel was concerned, his study of Jeremiah in particular indicated that the end of the exile was imminent, and through his prayer he intended to bring about the action of Yahweh on behalf of his people through his humble repentance. One last time he gives as the reason for his plea the fact that both city and people are 'called by your name', i.e. have a special relationship to Yahweh, despite their past failures.

Of course, if the time of Antiochus Epiphanes is assumed, then Daniel's prayer was not for the end of the exile, but for the end of the desecration of the sanctuary and the persecution of God's people during that time. Seow (2003:145), who takes this view, notes that the 'appeal to God is not ... on the basis of the wickedness of the foreign aggressor ...' nor Israel's own righteousness – in fact, it 'acknowledges the sins of the people past and present' – but 'on the assumption of divine righteousness, mercy, and will to forgive ... The basis for hope ... lies not in anything that mortals do but on the will of God to save, regardless of what human beings may have done.'

¹⁰³ Steinmann (2008:442) notes that apart from Daniel 9:19-20, 'idioms with Qal and Hiphil forms of the verb נָפַל, "fall," and the noun תְּהִנָּה, "prayer for grace," occur only in Jeremiah ..., once again demonstrating Daniel's thorough knowledge of that book.'

2.3.2.2.4 Summary Remarks on בְּרִית in Daniel's Prayer (9:1-19)

Daniel's prayer, unlike the remainder of the Hebrew section of the book, is written in good classical Hebrew. The language is similar to that of other penitential prayers (e.g. in Ezra and Nehemiah) and to that of the Deuteronomist (notably Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple), though Goldingay (1991:234) is probably right in noting that despite some verbal similarities, the author of this prayer was hardly writing with those texts before him, but merely used common means of expression (cf. Wallace 1979:154). In my opinion the prayer is an integral part of the chapter, and the book as a whole, rather than a later interpolation by a second century BCE author. It states explicitly that the captivity and exile were the result of Israel's sin, not the failure of Yahweh or the mere whims of a Babylonian king. It is my conviction that the prayer deliberately tempers the determinism of the visions: in view of its placement at the centre of the visions, it seems that the prayer shows that their fulfilment will not just be the result of mere determinism, but there will be a role for God's faithfulness and human action as well. In chapter 11 those 'having insight' are not passive observers, but active participants in the predicted events as those who teach others also, and prayer, including penitentiary and supplicatory prayer, is one of the actions that would fit the context there.

There is far more explicit covenant language in this chapter (and this part of the chapter) than elsewhere in the book. One may observe with Goldingay (1991:234) that 'the prayer is an acknowledgement of the covenant God (vv. 4, 7a, 14b, 15a), of the breaking of the covenant through Israel's failure to keep covenantal commitment (vv. 5-6, 7b, 8, 9b-11, 15b), and of the appropriateness of God's treatment of Israel in the framework of the covenant (vv. 11b-14).' Furthermore, the prayer appeals to God's grace which is based on his covenant commitment, and also points 'implicitly to the possibility of forgiveness and restoration announced in the covenant for people who repent of their covenantal failure' (Goldingay 1991:234).

The present chapter is one of the few instances in Daniel where the word covenant (בְּרִית) occurs explicitly, namely in a title for Yahweh who is addressed as 'keeper of the covenant and the lovingkindness' (שֹׁמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד), and in Daniel 9:27 in the rather enigmatic statement that 'he (whoever 'he' is) will הַגְבִּיר בְּרִית with the many.' The covenant referred to in Daniel 9:4 is most likely the Sinai covenant, though this does not mean that especially the Abrahamic covenant and perhaps even the Davidic covenant are not also included. A number of word studies have explored in more detail other covenant-related terms and implicit references to the covenant such as אָהַב and חֶסֶד. Further covenant related themes such as the significance of Moses, the role of the prophets as covenant enforcers, the references to the written laws and covenant curses, as well as the references

to and actual use of God's covenant name, Yahweh, and the shame and reproach Israel faced because of her covenant breaches have also been mentioned (cf. Goldingay 1991:234).

2.3.3 The Answer to the Prayer (9:20-27)

Daniel's prayer is completed in verse 19. Whether or not he did expect an answer is a moot question, but he did nonetheless get one, which is recorded in verses 20-27.¹⁰⁴ Daniel 9:20-27, especially verses 24-27, contain 'one of the most enigmatic passages from the HB' (van der Kooij 1993:496). The amount of literature dealing with this text is enormous, and it is impossible to include all the contributions that have been made over the centuries, or even over the last few decades. The following exposition is an attempt to interpret these verses afresh, including as much of recent literature of which I am aware and is available and accessible to me, and with particular reference to covenant and related themes, as this is one of the few parts of Daniel where that word appears explicitly. An attempt will also be made to relate these verses to the prayer at the beginning of the chapter, since they present the response to this prayer, but also to the wider context of the visions of Daniel 7-12 and ultimately to the book as a whole.

2.3.3.1 The Angel Gabriel Arrives (9:20)

Daniel 9:20 introduces the answer to Daniel's prayer by noting, in the same terms that have occurred earlier on in the chapter, that while he was still in the business of confessing his own and his people's sins and praying 'on behalf of the holy mountain of my God', the answer to the prayer came in the form of the 'man' Gabriel, whom he had already seen in a previous vision (chapter 8).

The verbs used are participles: Daniel was still (עוֹד) 'speaking' (Pi pt; מְדַבֵּר), 'praying' (Hitp pt; מְתַפִּלֵּל), and 'confessing' (Hitp pt; מְתוֹדֵה) his own sins (חַטָּאתֵי) as well as those of his 'people Israel' (עַמֵּי יִשְׂרָאֵל); furthermore, he was still 'presenting' (lit. 'letting fall', מְפִיל, Hiph pt; cf. v. 19) his supplications before 'Yahweh' his 'God' (לְפָנֵי יְהוָה) in prayer (בְּתַפִּלָּה; lit. in *the* prayer). The idea is that Daniel was, for quite some time, continuously praying and interceding in a humble attitude before God. He is praying for the 'holy mountain of my God' (הַר־קֹדֶשׁ אֱלֹהֵי), i.e. the Temple and its precincts. Though he

¹⁰⁴ Kline (1974:458) believes that the response recorded in these verses corresponds 'to the promise of covenant remembrance and renewal' as indicated in Leviticus 26:42-45, since prayers of repentance are usually followed by covenant renewal. This may be so but there are exceptions (cf. Neh 1) and the text of Daniel 9:20-27 is rather too vague to make such a definite statement.

does not say so in as many words, Daniel is praying for the restoration not only of the city of Jerusalem and the return of the exiles to their own land, but for the restoration of the Temple and with it the worship system of the Jews. The reference originally was probably to the destruction under Nebuchadnezzar in 587/6 BCE, though of course the Jews under Antiochus Epiphanes would have found this prayer just as appropriate in their situation.¹⁰⁵

Noteworthy is also the repetition of the first person pronominal suffix: Daniel was confessing ‘*my* sin’, and that of ‘*my* people Israel,’ presenting ‘*my* supplication’ before ‘*my* God’ on behalf of the ‘holy mountain of *my* God.’ Collins (1993:351) rightly notes that this shows that Daniel ‘underlines his role as representative of the people, despite their sins.’ Despite the repeated occurrence of the first person pronoun or pronominal suffix, Daniel is not self-centred in his prayer, but has God’s interest and that of his people at heart. He prays, as noted, for the restoration of the holy city and the temple, precisely because it is the city and temple *of God*, not his own, or merely that of his people.

The expression מְעֵף בְּיָעַף is difficult. Grammatically, the expression is a Hophalms absolute participle of יָעַף (‘swift flight’ or ‘deeply weary’, HALOT, BDB, according to the parsing guide of Logos Bible software) plus a masculine singular absolute noun (יָעַף; ‘flight [trad. Fatigue]’, HALOT) with prefixed preposition ב. Whether the expression should be translated ‘swift flight’ (e.g. KJV; ESV; RSV; NRSV; TNEV; these translations derive the words from the root עָוַף, ‘to fly’) or ‘extreme weariness’ (NASB; NET; i.e. taking the root to be יָעַף) is a debated question. The arguments for both options are compelling¹⁰⁶ but too involved for the purpose of the present work. I believe that the NASB and NET translators have made a choice that seems to account better for the evidence of the Hebrew text than, for example, KJV. It does take the text seriously, and it does not needlessly amend it or assume a scribal error (which is, of course, possible). Thus I prefer the translation ‘in extreme weariness’ and that the phrase refers to Daniel, but one cannot be dogmatic either way.

The expression הַר־קֹדֶשׁ here refers to the Jerusalem Temple and its surroundings, but Daniel equates the phrase in 9:16 with the whole city of Jerusalem.¹⁰⁷ The word קֹדֶשׁ ‘connotes the concept of “holiness,” i.e. the essential nature of that which belongs to the sphere of the sacred’ and which is thus ‘distinct from the common or profane’ (McComiskey 1999:786). In terms of things belonging to God, such as in this case, i.e. the

¹⁰⁵ Pace (2008:296) in fact notes that ‘Daniel’s prayer ... truly becomes the prayer for the community of the author’s day who sees a defiled temple that, in essence, belongs to the new Nebuchadnezzar – Antiochus.’

¹⁰⁶ Cf. e.g. Collins 1993:351-52; Porteous 1965:139; Walvoord 1971:215; Goldingay 1991:225, 228; Keil & Delitzsch 1996:715.

¹⁰⁷ Psalm 48:2 [Eng. v. 1] also seems to equate the two, though there the name of the city is not mentioned, but it is merely stated that God is greatly to be praised ‘in the city of our God, his holy mountain.’

‘holy mountain,’ the idea is that no ‘cultic pollution’ is present, ‘which is symbolic of moral pollution’ (McComiskey 1999:787; cf. also Naudé 1997:879-881). Holy things may not be used for common or profane purposes (McComiskey 1999:787). ‘The maintenance of the integrity of the “holy” was a function of the Israelite cultus,’ and furthermore, the cultus ‘effected the holiness of those who participated in it’ (McComiskey 1999:787). This is the essence of redemption ‘for, by definition, holiness is separate from all that is sinful and profane,’ (McComiskey 1999:787) and of course, only those who were themselves holy could remain in God’s presence (cf. Ps 15:1, which incidentally also mentions the ‘holy mountain:’ הַר קְדוֹשׁ). When the Babylonians destroyed the temple, this function could no longer be upheld, and the same of course applied when Antiochus desecrated the temple through his pagan rituals. In both cases, the ‘holy mountain’ had become the exact opposite, מְשׁוּמָם. Like the people of Israel, it was in need of redemption in order to function again as it was supposed to. This is what Daniel was praying for.

The ‘angel’ (here simply labelled ‘man’ אִישׁ) Gabriel is mentioned by name only here and in Daniel 8:16.¹⁰⁸ Apart from Michael (Dn 10:13, 26) he is the only angel to be given a name in the Bible. Collins (1993:351) plausibly suggests that Gabriel could be “one of the [anonymous] attendants” in 7:16, who also has the function of interpreter.’

Gabriel came to (or ‘reached,’ or ‘touched;’ נִגַּע¹⁰⁹) Daniel ‘about the time of the evening offering’ (NASB), i.e. about mid-afternoon (Baldwin 1978:167; Young 1949:190 gives 3-4 p.m. as a time indication),¹¹⁰ at the time when the evening sacrifices used to be offered (whether or not they had been reinstated by this time is debatable; cf. Baldwin 1978:167), ‘at one of the stated times of prayer’ (Porteous 1965:139). Collins (1993:352) remarks that this note shows a ‘preoccupation with the disrupted cult’ which is ‘continuous with Daniel 8.’ Lacocque (1979:189), who argues for a second century dating, takes the reference to the מִנְחָה, and the phrase עַל הַר-קְדוֹשׁ אֶלְהֵי together. In his opinion Daniel was ‘upon’ (the literal meaning of עַל) the Temple mountain as he was praying, at the very time when the evening offering was being sacrificed. This literal interpretation of the preposition is, in my opinion, not very likely, even in a second century setting. If proper Jewish worship was proscribed, it is unlikely that Daniel (or the writer of the chapter

¹⁰⁸ And in the New Testament in Luke 1:19 and 26 where he appears to Zechariah and Mary respectively to announce the births of John the Baptist and Jesus. Baldwin (1978:167) suggests that the mention of Gabriel in both Daniel 8:16 and 9:21 implies unity of authorship for these two chapters, and by implication also with chapter 7.

¹⁰⁹ The Hebrew word can mean ‘touched’, which is how it is translated by Theodotion and the Vulgate (cf. Collins 1993:345, n. 38). Steinmann (2008:444) observes that the Qal stem normally means ‘touch,’ (and this is used here), whereas the Hiphil stem means ‘approach, come to’ (it is used in Dn 8:7; 12:12), but comparison with HALOT shows that both translations appear under both stems.

¹¹⁰ Pace (2008:297) explains that this time reference ‘suggests that just as God accepted the sacrifice of the Israelites when the temple was still standing, so too would Daniel’s prayer be accepted. For the readers of Antiochus’ day, the text indicates that prayer can still be acceptable even when Antiochus had proscribed certain rites and polluted the temple.’

posing as Daniel) would have literally gone there and received a revelation there in the midst of enemy occupied territory, and probably at a time when pagan sacrifices would have been offered. In the case of a sixth/fifth century setting it would in any case be impossible since Daniel was probably in Babylon when he prayed and subsequently received the answer to his prayer. Lacocque (1979:189-90) is more correct in his assertion that it is

a ... telescoping of two realities which the Author unites here: the Temple is heavenly and earthly, transcending space as the cultus transcends time. Finding himself in Babylon during the reign of Darius, Daniel turns toward Jerusalem ... at the moment of the evening offering, and, in effect, he is in the Temple, offering the *minḥah*. The message to the reader in the second century is clear: Antiochus' interdiction against offering the sacrifice ... and his profaning the Temple are insupportable and God is going to end this blasphemy; but, in truth, nothing and no one may act in any way against the Temple and its divine office.

2.3.3.2 Gabriel Speaks to Daniel – Words of Assurance (9:21-22)

The purpose of the angelic visit is to ‘give understanding’ (יָדַע) or ‘instruction’ (NASB) or ‘insight’ (with the basic underlying idea of ‘discernment; Goldberg 1999:103) by talking to Daniel. As noted above in the discussion of שָׂכַל, ‘understanding’ or ‘insight’ is a very important concept in Daniel. The verb יָדַע is often used in wisdom contexts, though that does not mean that it always must be a wisdom word¹¹¹ (cf. Ringgren 1977:100). It is, however, significant that the verb occurs twenty-two times in the six Hebrew chapters of Daniel.¹¹² Ringgren (1977:100) suggests that in the Qal the main meaning of the verb is ‘to give heed to, to perceive’ (cf. Dn 9:2), and it apparently appears in contexts with ‘an ideological-theological emphasis.’ The verb is often ‘used to convey the idea of giving attention to God’s deeds’, and includes both the gathering of facts and the knowledge of how to use them (Ringgren 1977:100). Indeed, for those who are faithful to God and his covenant such ‘insight’ or ‘knowledge’ is an essential requirement.¹¹³ In contrast to יָדַע, which ‘generally describes the process whereby one gains knowledge through experience with objects and circumstances, *bîn* is a power of judgment and perceptive insight and is

¹¹¹ Incidentally, the first two occurrences of the word are in the Joseph narrative in Genesis 41 where Joseph interprets Pharaoh’s dreams. This section of Genesis is often considered to have strong wisdom influence, a position advocated for example by von Rad (1966:300) who concludes that ‘the Joseph narrative is a didactic wisdom story which leans heavily upon influences emanating from Egypt,’ though this view has not gone unchallenged. Fox (2001:40) for example opines that ‘There is indeed wisdom in the Joseph story, but it is not the wisdom of Wisdom literature. The concept of wisdom in the Joseph story is affiliated with the pietistic and inspired wisdom of Daniel rather than with the ethical and practical wisdom of Wisdom literature.’

¹¹² Only Proverbs (34x), Psalms (26x) and Job (26x; i.e. 79x in these three books) use it more often, and these are all much longer books. The related verb יָדַע, usually translated ‘understanding’ or ‘wise,’ appears 63 times in the MT, with most occurrences in Proverbs (13x), Psalms (12x) and Daniel (9x).

¹¹³ Cf. Deuteronomy 4:6; 32:29; Psalm 119:27, 34 etc.; Isaiah 1:3; 43:10; Jeremiah 4:22 etc. The theme of ‘understanding’ and ‘knowing’ is frequently taken up in the NT where believers are called upon to ‘know’ Christ, or some aspect of Christ’s or Paul’s teaching (e.g. Lk 24:45; Jn 10:38; 1 Cor 12:1-3; Eph 3:19). Of course, the concept is also important in the DSS where it is used to express the sectarians’ correct understanding of and insight into the word and will of God, e.g. CD 2:14; 6:2 (where both בִּין and בִּרִית appear); 1QS 4:22; 1QH^a 4:21-22 etc. (see below).

demonstrated in the use of knowledge’ (Ringgren 1977:100).¹¹⁴ Goldberg (1999:104) observes that though ‘understanding is a gift of God, it does not come automatically.’ Persistent diligence is required to gain it (Goldberg 1999:104). ‘It is more than IQ; it connotes character. One is at fault if he doesn’t have it and in fact, not to pursue it will incur God’s punishment’ (Goldberg 1999:104; cf. Is 1:3; Jr 4:22; 9:12-13 etc.). The noun form refers to understanding in general, but also to the ‘faculty of understanding’ and the ‘object of knowledge’ (Goldberg 1999:104). In the book of Proverbs in particular, wisdom and understanding are often used synonymously.

In Daniel 9 the verb occurs three times, first in verse 2 where Daniel says that he ‘understood’ or ‘observed’ (NASB) from the book of Jeremiah that the number of years for Israel’s exile would be seventy years. In the present verse, as well as in Daniel 9:23, the word is used by Gabriel to tell Daniel that he had come to give him ‘*understanding*’ of the things he had prayed for. Lucas (2002:241) insightfully remarks that ‘[w]ithin the implied sixth-century setting of ch. 9, the point was not that Daniel did not understand the *meaning* of Jeremiah’s prophecy, but that it had a *reference* beyond its most obvious reference to the ending of the Babylonian exile. It is this future reference that Gabriel comes to reveal to Daniel’ (cf. Goldingay 1991:256). Goldingay (1991:256) adds: ‘Theologically ... the significance of this passage cannot be discerned by ordinary human study; it can only be received by revelation – like the original prophecy, or like visions such as those received elsewhere by Daniel. In order to understand the prophecies [Daniel] needs the same divine inspiration that the prophet [Jeremiah] himself had received.’ This is what Gabriel proceeds to provide, and this ties in with Ringgren’s remark that in Daniel the root is ‘used remarkably often ... [to refer] to apocalyptic understanding’ (Ringgren 1977:107).

In verse 23 Gabriel states that Daniel had hardly started to pray (בְּתֹחֶלֶת תְּחִנּוֹתָיִךְ ‘at the beginning of your supplications’) when ‘word went out’ (יֵצֵא דְבָר; my translation; NASB more idiomatically: ‘the command was issued’), presumably from God. The Hebrew expression is not definite, so it is not quite clear what command is referred to, whether the command to Gabriel to go to Daniel, or the specific message that Gabriel went on to give Daniel in the next few verses, but most likely the latter (cf. e.g. Montgomery

¹¹⁴ Fretheim (1997:652) notes that בִּינָה seems to be less relational than יָדַע, though the two words can be synonymous. Moreover, בִּינָה ‘is used more to refer to the insight that comes from knowing,’ as well as to express perception ‘through the senses.’ From there, the root comes ‘to refer to the insight and understanding that is achieved through such observation’ (Fretheim 1997:652).

1927:371). The reason for the angelic visitation is that Daniel is ‘highly esteemed’ (תְּמוּדוֹת (אֲתָהּ)).¹¹⁵

Because of God’s high estimation of Daniel, Daniel is given the special revelation that follows in verses 24-27, but this will not happen without some effort on Daniel’s part. Two imperatives of the verb בִּין follow, one Qal and one Hiphil: Daniel has to ‘give heed to the message (בִּין בְּדָבָר; Qal impt 2ms) and gain understanding (הִבִּין; Hiph impt 2ms) of the vision (בְּמַרְאֵה).’ If there is any difference in the nuance of meaning, in the Qal there seems to be included the idea of ‘paying attention’, i.e. human effort, whereas in the Hiphil the emphasis seems to be more on the actual understanding or comprehension of the matter taught (cf. the definitions in HALOT).¹¹⁶

The reference to the revelation as ‘vision’ (מַרְאֵה) is strange, since at first sight there is no visionary experience reported. Montgomery (1927:371-372) suggests that both הָזוֹן and מַרְאֵה can be used for ocular as well as auditory revelations,¹¹⁷ whereas Keil and Delitzsch (1996:715) propose that מַרְאֵה refers to the vision of the interpreting angel, Gabriel, i.e. the form of the communication.

2.3.3.3 Explanation of Things to Come (9:24-27)

The last four verses of Daniel 9 give the enigmatic prophecy of the ‘seventy sevens’ that has baffled Bible students for centuries. It is notable that verse 24 is introduced with the instruction in verse 23 to ‘give heed to the message and understanding,’ and that a similar instruction is repeated at the beginning of verse 25, but not before or in verses 26 and 27: ‘So you are to know and discern...’ (וְתִדְעוּ וְתִשְׁכְּלוּ). It appears, therefore, that verse 24 is a summary of the ‘seventy sevens’ and verses 25-27 give more details concerning them (cf. among others Lacocque 1979:194; Longman 1999:227; Steinmann 2008:468).

¹¹⁵ The expression describes God’s estimation of Daniel (though God is not explicitly mentioned), and together with Daniel 10:11 and 19, is the only place where the word is used for a human being. Elsewhere in Daniel, the word refers to things: ‘tasty (תְּמוּדוֹת) food’ (or bread; Dn 10:3); ‘treasures’ (NASB; i.e. ‘desirable things’; Dn 11:38, 43). In each case, whether things or Daniel are meant, the reference is to something highly treasured or very valuable. Montgomery (1927:371) notes that a similar root is used in lovers’ language in Song of Songs 5:16.

¹¹⁶ Goldingay (1991:228, n. 23d-d) suggests that the phrase וְתִדְעוּ וְתִשְׁכְּלוּ is ‘a double hendiadys’ and translates ‘give careful heed to the revelatory word.’ He also argues that, as Jeremiah’s book continued to be studied in the second century BCE, that historical situation posed ‘questions about the meaning of Scripture, to which [the present] revelation provides the answer’ (Goldingay 1991:256).

¹¹⁷ Cf. also Baldwin (1978:168) who suggests that the word simply means ‘revelation,’ and Miller (1994:252) who argues that a general prophetic revelation is in view.

2.3.3.3.1 Daniel 9:24

With verse 24 the revelation proper starts. It moves straight into an interpretation of the expression ‘seventy years’ (more literally ‘seventy sevens’) and explains that Daniel must look further than the seventy more or less literal years (of exile) Jeremiah had been speaking about. During the ‘seventy sevens’ (שְׁבַעִים) six things will be accomplished: ‘to finish the transgression (לְכַלֵּא הַפְּשָׁע), to make an end of sin (וּלְהַתֵּם חַטָּאוֹת), to make atonement for iniquity (וּלְכַפֵּר עֲוֹן), to bring in everlasting righteousness (וּלְהַבְיֵא צְדָק עֲלָמִים), to seal up vision and prophecy (וּלְהַתֵּם חֲזוֹן וְנְבִיא) and to anoint the most holy place (וּלְמַשֵּׁחַ קֹדֶשׁ קְדוֹשִׁים)’ (NASB). These six things have been grouped by scholars either into three pairs¹¹⁸ or two groups of three. The latter seems to make more sense, since the first three items all have to do with dealing with sin in one way or another, and each consists of two terms in Hebrew, whereas the last three items in the list consist of three terms each and seem to point to the result of dealing with sin. Moreover, it appears that each of the three items in the first list is matched by the corresponding item in the second list of three (cf. the arrangement in the BHS). In other words, ‘to finish transgression’ appears to be paralleled by ‘to bring in everlasting righteousness;’ ‘to make an end of sin’ by ‘to seal up vision and prophecy’ (here even the verb is the same if the alternative reading is accepted); and ‘to make atonement’ by ‘to anoint the most holy.’

Gabriel starts by telling Daniel that ‘seventy sevens have been decreed for your people and for your holy city’ (שְׁבַעִים נְחֻתָּה עַל-עַמְּךָ וְעַל-יְרֵיךָ קְדוֹשֶׁה; my translation, but cf. NASB). Jeremiah only speaks about ‘seventy years’ (שְׁבַעִים שָׁנָה; Jr 25:12; 29:10), and the word ‘seventy’ there seems to indicate seventy years’ duration for the Babylonian rule (29:10) or the exile (25:10-12), with the proviso that ‘seventy’ in that context is most likely not to be taken literally. The multiplication of the ‘seventy’ in Daniel 9:24 is reminiscent of such texts as Genesis 4:24 or Leviticus 26:18, 21, 24, 28.¹¹⁹ When counting the punishments listed after such a number it is clear that the sevenfold¹²⁰ punishment is

¹¹⁸ Gowan (2001:134) for example prefers to group the six items in the present verse into three pairs rather than two triplets, arguing that the first two are ‘looking ahead to the “end” of the tyrant promised in verse 27; the next two promising the forgiveness Daniel had requested in his prayer; and the last two looking beyond what is said in verses 25-27, to the fulfillment of the decreed end.’

¹¹⁹ ‘If Cain is avenged sevenfold, then Lamech seventy-sevenfold’ (Gn 4:24; NASB); ‘If also after these things you do not obey Me, then I will punish you seven times more for your sins’ (Lv 26:18; NASB). Cf. McComiskey (1985:38), who notes that the idea here is ‘of commensurate punishment’, as also in Psalm 79:12.

¹²⁰ Kapelrud (1968:494-495) states that in the ANE seven is a ‘holy number’ or ‘simply a round number,’ but it may also indicate completeness or totality (Kapelrud 1968:495; cf. McComiskey 1985:39), ‘fulfilment’ or ‘finishing’ (Kapelrud 1968:499), ‘a long, hard and exacting time’ (Kapelrud 1968:496), or ‘fate’ (Kapelrud 1968:497, referring to Gn 41). It was used to refer to ‘an indefinite number,’ or ‘intensity, quality, not necessarily quantity,’ and even to indicate ‘maximum’ (Kapelrud 1968:499). Though his remarks concern Ugaritic texts, they are valid for biblical ones too.

not to be taken literally, but it is simply a literary device to convey the seriousness of the consequences that await Israel should she fail to keep the covenant.¹²¹

In favour of a figurative/symbolic meaning of שְׁבַעִים שָׁבָעִים is the fact that somehow it is reminiscent of Jesus' answer to Peter's query regarding how often he should forgive his brother, whether 'seven' times was enough. Jesus answered he was to forgive not seven times, but seventy times seven (Mt 18:21-22; cf. Wallace 1979:164). The point is that both in Matthew 18 and Daniel 9 the assumption of the questioner (Peter) or person praying (Daniel) is that a certain figure is enough to comply with the required standard (forgiving seven times; the period of exile). In both cases, the assumption is proved wrong by the answer given where the issue is redefined. Furthermore, it seems that in each case the answer is phrased in a way that indicates that a precise numerical figure was not in view in any case, and the enquirer is in fact discouraged from looking for such an accurate number or, in Daniel's case, date.¹²² Perhaps in Daniel 9:24 this is already indicated by the fact that the word שְׁבַעִים appears with an unusual masculine plural ending¹²³ instead of the more familiar feminine plural ending. In fact, this particular form of the word only occurs in Daniel 9:24-25 and in 10:3-4 (translated 'weeks'). It almost appears as if Daniel (or the author of these two chapters) has coined this term and used it for his own purposes.¹²⁴

It is also noteworthy that the seventy sevens are subdivided into three parts: seven sevens, sixty-two sevens, and one seven, each of which 'ends with the mention of an event concerning a "messiah"' (Lacocque 1979:194). This is reminiscent of the division of

¹²¹ Cf. Daniel 3:19 (McComiskey 1985:38). McComiskey (1985:39-40) points out that '[i]n Babylonian astrological and omen texts' the number seven indicates that '[t]he action progresses until it culminates in the event of greatest importance in the seventh period.' In schematized dynastic sequences the number seven is often used as a literary device, not a precise figure (McComiskey 1985:40).

¹²² Cf. Stahl (1993:482) who observes that this 'Aussage gerade durch "geheimnisvolle Undeutlichkeit präzises Rechnen" verhindern will.' Although he refers to 7:25, I think that the principle is applicable in the present context as well. Similarly Wallace (1979:156) says that 'we have the impression that God wishes to assure his people about the future without allowing them to become preoccupied with calendar matters.'

¹²³ Curiously, though the masculine plural ending is unusual in the MT, it is quite common in the DSS where 27 out of 53 occurrences of שְׁבַעִים are mp. Most interesting is the fact that the *terminus technicus* 'Feast of Weeks' (normally שְׁבַעִים; e.g. Dt 16:10) is שְׁבַעִים in 4Q319, 320 & 321 (all Calendrical Texts). Hasel (1993:113) argues that the masculine plural ending 'emphasizes the global and unitary aspect of the time element "seventy weeks," or more generally 'expresses the idea of a group as a totality' (Hasel 1993:114), whereas the feminine plural ending 'would have stressed the individual parts – i.e. the individual weeks – of the "seventy weeks"' (Hasel 1993:113). Considering the evidence of the Calendrical Texts, this suggestion may go too far. At least at Qumran, the masculine plural seems to have been quite common, and this shift from the feminine plural to the masculine plural may already be evident in Daniel.

Lurie (1990:306) suggests that שְׁבַעִים simply means any integer multiple of seven (7, 14, 21 etc. ; cf. Keil & Delitzsch 1996:718 of whom he seems to be unaware: 'שְׁבַעִים does not necessarily mean year-weeks, but an intentionally indefinite designation of a period of time measured by the number seven, whose chronological duration must be determined on other grounds'). He calculates the 69 weeks from Cyrus' decree to Jesus' birth (which he dates to 538 BCE and 6 BCE respectively; Lurie 1990:307f) and believes that the last 'seven' in Dn 9:27 lasted 70 years and refers to the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70 (Lurie 1990:309). The problem with this and other similar efforts is that it tries to work out detailed dates for what appears to have been left deliberately ambiguous in the text.

¹²⁴ Others, however, think differently. Lacocque (1979:188) suggests that the unusual form in this verse presents a word play with שְׁבַעִים; Hartmann and Di Lella (1978:244) argue that it is an Aramaism.

seven seals, trumpets and bowls in Revelation, which are also divided into three parts each, namely four, two and one, with an emphasis on the last, seventh, seal, trumpet or bowl.¹²⁵ In my opinion, there is a similar emphasis in Daniel 9:24-27 on the last seven (cf. Kline 1974:459), even though the division here is not graded in the same way as in Revelation.

Many scholars observe that the reference to ‘seventy sevens’ is reminiscent of the ‘sabbatical theology of Leviticus 25-26’ (Collins 1993:352). In Leviticus 26 we find a list of blessings and curses in case the covenant was kept or broken. A similar list appears in Deuteronomy 28, but Deuteronomy does not replicate the repeated threat of Leviticus 26 that God would punish Israel ‘seven times more’ because of her refusal to repent (cf. Bergsma 2007:220, 226). In Leviticus 25, Israel is enjoined to keep a Sabbath year every seventh year, and a jubilee after every 49th year (cf. Collins 1993:452-353; Bergsma 2007; Kline 1974) in which debts would be cancelled and slaves released. The Chronicler (2 Chr 36:18-21) says the reason for the exile is Israel’s failure to let the land have its designated Sabbaths, but Daniel 9:24 seems to reinterpret Jeremiah’s prophecy of the seventy year exile differently by extending the period ‘to seventy weeks of years, or ten jubilees’ (Collins 1993:352). Kline (1974:460) states that this ‘sabbatical pattern is a covenantal pattern’ since from Genesis 2:4 onwards ‘the Sabbath has functioned as a sign of the covenant relationship.’ He argues that in the Mosaic legislation, ‘the Sabbath served as a sign of the messianic age of redemptive liberation, restitution, and rest’ and therefore he believes that Gabriel’s answer in Daniel 9:24-27 shows that ‘this prophecy is fundamentally concerned with God’s covenant with Israel, and especially with the consummation of that covenant’ (Kline 1974:460).

In this sabbatical system, the seventy sevens are considered to be ‘weeks of years,’ i.e. 490 years (Collins 1993:352), which equals ten jubilees. Bergsma (2007:227) observes that ‘[t]en jubilees constitute a period of quintessential completeness,’ since ten ‘symbolizes wholeness, completeness, integrity’ (cf. Burton 2000:974).¹²⁶ Similar schematizations of epochs can be found in other Jewish works such as *Jubilees*, the Enoch literature (esp. the *Apocalypse of Weeks* and the *Animal Apocalypse*,¹²⁷ cf. Collins 1993:352-353), and *11QMelchizedek* (Kline 1974:459). However, these generally use

¹²⁵ Ryken, Wilhoit and Longman (1998:775) observe that ‘in a series of seven the seventh is sometimes different from the other six and climactic;’ e.g. the seventh day of the week, the Sabbath; the seventh sign in John’s gospel, the resurrection of Christ. Cf. also McComiskey (1985:39-40) quoted above.

¹²⁶ Bergsma (2007:227) also highlights the importance of the Day of Atonement ‘on the tenth day of the seventh month’ on which the Jubilee was declared. On that day, ‘wholeness in the cultic and spiritual realm’ was restored, whereas ‘the jubilee re-establish[ed] it in the social and economic realm’ (Bergsma 2007:227). In his opinion, Daniel 9:24 predicts such a jubilee at the end of the seventy week period where Israel would be rid of her sin as well as ‘released from socio-economic bondage and return . . . to her land’ (Bergsma 2007:227).

¹²⁷ Collins (1993:353) believes that the *Animal Apocalypse* is probably more or less contemporary with Daniel, and in this work the ‘seventy periods [of history] refer to the post-exilic period, when Israel is given over to seventy shepherds (1 En 89:59).’

‘division of history into ten “weeks” or seventy periods’ which have ‘symbolic rather than chronological value’ (Collins 1993:352-353). Though a number of scholars, including Kline (1974) and Collins (1993), believe that ‘the reinterpretation of Jeremiah’s prophecy in Daniel 9 must be seen in this context’ (Collins 1993:353),¹²⁸ it is significant that the chronology in Daniel does not use a ten-part scheme, but rather a three-part division of the seventy sevens. Thus, though the symbolism of ten jubilees was probably in the background, it is not utilized explicitly, but merely alluded to (cf. Goldingay 1991:261; contra Bergsma 2007:226ff, Collins 1993:353, Kline 1974:359-461). It is also significant that the NT does not hark back to the ten part system of the apocalypses but to the three part system advocated in Daniel.

Daniel states that the ‘seventy sevens have been *decreed*’ (or *ordained*, HALOT; דָּקַדְקָה, a Niphal pf 3ms of דָּקַח, the only finite verb in the sentence)¹²⁹ ‘over’ or ‘concerning’ (rather than ‘against’, as Montgomery 1927:373) ‘*your* people’ and ‘*your* holy city.’ The second person pronominal suffix is significant. In the prayer Daniel had identified himself with his people and their destiny; here Gabriel reiterates this identification (cf. Young 1949:197). Lacocque (1979:192) remarks that in designating the people and city as *your* people and *your* city, Gabriel expresses the notion that Daniel ‘represents the true Israel.’

The other six verbs in the verse are infinitive constructs with the prepositional prefix ל and God as the implied subject (cf. Collins 1993:353). The ל appears to introduce purpose clauses. Collins (1993:353) notes that ‘[t]aken together they constitute an eschatological ideal.’ The first phrase is לְכַלֵּא הַפֶּשַׁע, ‘to complete’ or ‘to finish transgression’ (NASB). לְכַלֵּא (Piel inf cons.) is a difficult form. The Piel of כָּלָא does not exist (apart from this verse, if it is accepted as the correct reading). כָּלָא means ‘shut up, restrain, withhold’ in the Qal (BDB), and in my opinion this does not really make sense in the present context (but cf. Young 1949:197 who prefers this reading). The BHS therefore

¹²⁸ Collins (1993:353) suggests that the concept of Daniel’s “seventy weeks of years” has overtones not only of the Levitical understanding of the covenant but also of apocalyptic determinism.’ Kline (1974:461) believes that ‘Daniel 9 as a whole follows the covenant administration pattern of Leviticus 26. The prayer ... corresponds to the *Todah*-confession of Leviticus 26:40f, and the prophecy ... corresponds to the covenant restitution and renewal of Leviticus 26:42f.’ He notes that the seventy weeks ‘are seen as a series of jubilees culminating in a proclamation of deliverance, atonement, vengeance on Zion’s enemies, and the establishing of God’s covenant among his people.’ There is some truth in this statement, though I do not agree with his interpretation of the word ‘covenant’ in verse 27 (see the exegesis on this verse below).

¹²⁹ In the MT, דָּקַח is a *hapax legomenon* (the only occurrence in the DSS is translated ‘decreed’). In Rabbinic Hebrew the word means ‘cut’ (Alden 1999:334), and in medieval and modern Hebrew it may mean ‘decide, pronounce a sentence,’ which is why the translation ‘decreed’ is used in most versions (Nicole and Carpenter 1997:323). In the Greek versions, Theodotion translates συνεμήθησαν, ‘cut off,’ whereas OG translates ἐκρίθησαν, ‘decreed.’ The Latin follows Theodotion by translating *breviatae sunt*; the Vulgate has *abbreviatae*, i.e. ‘are shortened’ (Montgomery 1927:373-374, though Montgomery 1927:373 prefers ‘decreed’). Doukhan (1989:32) advocates ‘cut off’ (with Theodotion), based on the majority of Mishnaic use (Doukhan 1989:172, n. 65). In his opinion, the ‘fact that the 70 weeks of Daniel 9 are said to be “cut off” implies that they must belong to a longer and already known period of time, i.e. the 2300 evenings and mornings of Daniel 8’ (Doukhan 1989:32). In my opinion, ‘decreed’ makes better sense, though perhaps there is less difference between the two translations than Doukhan makes out.

suggests the reading כלה, which has the basic idea of bringing ‘a process to completion,’ either in the positive or negative sense (Oswalt 1999:439; cf. Domeris & Van Dam 1997:641).¹³⁰ Lucas (2002:229) notes that though either root can be read, the support of Qere, some Hebrew manuscripts and the versions for כלה, and the ‘[p]arallelism with the next clause suggests that it is what is intended.’ Later on he argues that כלא and the following verb, which he takes to be תמם, are ‘near synonyms for bringing something to an end’ (Lucas 2002:241).

What is to be ‘finished’ or ‘completed’ is עֲפָשָׁה, ‘the transgression’¹³¹ (BDB) or ‘rebellion, revolt’ (HALOT). The basic meaning of עֲפָשָׁה is ‘a breach of relationships, civil or religious, between two parties,’ and indicates the refusal to accept the authority of another, in particular that of God (Livingston 1999:741). In a covenant context the word entails deliberate disobedience, disloyalty and violation of the covenant laws, i.e. treachery, even treason, and thus the disruption of the relationship between God and Israel (cf. Carpenter & Grisanti 1997:707). In the context of the chapter, it appears that it is a summary term for all the sins that Daniel had mentioned earlier, i.e. the transgression of Israel against her covenant God (cf. Walvoord 1971:221; Baldwin 1978:168), which may also be the reason for the definite article. That it will be ‘completed’ means that ultimately God would bring about the restoration that Daniel had been praying for (cf. Walvoord 1971:221). This includes such historical fulfilments as the end of the atrocities of Antiochus Epiphanes (cf. Collins 1993:354 and Seow 2003:147) but in my opinion the expression is much more general. Therefore it is possible that an even wider application to the sins of mankind in general is implied.¹³²

The next phrase, לְהַתֵּמַם הַטָּאוֹת, is problematic as well. The MT¹³³ suggests the reading לְהַתֵּמַם (Hiph inf cons תמם, ‘to complete, bring to an end’), *and to complete or bring to an end sin*; but the BHS note indicates that Theodotion reads with Ketiv לְהַתֵּמַם (Qal inf cons תמם, ‘to seal up;’ καὶ τοῦ σφραγίσαι ἁμαρτίας), *and to seal up the sin*. In other words, apart from using a different root, both translations add ‘and,’ which is not present in the Ketiv. Both readings have their adherents. Goldingay (1991:226)¹³⁴ and Collins

¹³⁰ Köhler and Baumgartner (1958:437) define כלה for Daniel 9:24 as ‘bring to an end, finish,’ and both BDB and HALOT refer the reader to כלה. This verb also appears in Daniel 11:36 and 12:7 where it means ‘to complete’ (with a negative connotation), which corroborates the usage in the present verse.

¹³¹ Montgomery (1927:373) elides the article and simply translates ‘for finishing transgression,’ apparently following Theodotion (who translates simply ἁμαρτίαν, not τὴν ἁμαρτίαν as OG). He does not further justify his choice.

¹³² Young (1949:198) suggests that this was fulfilled by Christ on the cross.

¹³³ I.e. Qere, many mss and OG, καὶ τὰς ἀδικίας σπανίσαι.

¹³⁴ He translates ‘to do away with failures,’ (Goldingay 1991:226) and defends his reading by pointing out that the terms for ‘sin’ in the first three clauses are nearly synonymous (Goldingay 1991:258).

(1993:354) for example prefer the Qere,¹³⁵ whereas Keil and Delitzsch (1996) believe that the Qere does not make sense and read with Ketiv וְלָחַתָּם, ‘to seal up,’ in the sense of ‘to shut up.’ Walvoord (1971:221) argues that the phrase ‘to make an end of sins’ ‘may be taken either in the sense of taking away sins or bringing sin to final judgment’ or to read with Ketiv ‘to seal up sin.’ He suggests that rather than choosing one of these explanations, ‘[t]he final explanation may include all of these items because the eschatological conclusion of Israel’s history does indeed bring an end to their previous transgressions, brings their sin into judgment, and also introduces the element of forgiveness.’ Perhaps this is the most satisfactory solution to a difficult problem. However, if there is an intended parallel between this phrase and וְלָחַתָּם הַזֶּזוֹן וְנָבִיא (‘to seal vision and prophecy’), then Ketiv should be retained.

The last of the first three clauses is וְלִכְפֹּר עוֹן, ‘to cover/atone for iniquity.’ כִּפֵּר mainly occurs in contexts conveying the idea that sin is dealt with by some sort of removal, though it may simply mean ‘to cover’ (e.g. Gn 6:14).¹³⁶ In the present context it is used with עוֹן, an ‘activity that is crooked or wrong,’ i.e. ‘offense, sin, guilt,’ (HALOT) or ‘iniquity, guilt, punishment of iniquity’ (BDB).¹³⁷ Luc (1997b:351) observes that unlike the broader term הַטָּאָה, the word עוֹן ‘has predominantly religious, and ethical function[s].’ The word probably summarizes the different kinds of sins to be atoned for,¹³⁸ and the idea seems to be that God will deal with Israel’s sin once and for all. Longman (1999:226) for example notes that ‘to atone for wickedness’ does not just emphasize the theme of the first two [phrases], but ‘implies that God removes the consequences of already committed sinful behavior.’ Baldwin (1978:169) remarks that if ‘God is regarded as the subject, [this clause] is announcing that God has found a way of forgiving sin without being untrue to His own righteousness. This assurance was what the prayer had been feeling after; it was the great longing expressed in the Old Testament as a whole.’ Seow (2003:147) thinks that the first two clauses refer to Antiochus’ atrocities, but that the expression וְלִכְפֹּר עוֹן, which introduces the first of the positive notations in this list of six, also refers to Israel’s

¹³⁵ Collins (1993:354) refers to his treatment of 8:23, which also uses the word תָּמַם, ‘complete’ or ‘finish.’ There he notes that the ‘idea that iniquity must run its course before it is punished is found already in Gen 15:15’ (Collins 1993:339). He further argues that there is an element of determinism in this phrase.

¹³⁶ Harris (1999:453) lists this occurrence as a homonym of the root meaning ‘make atonement.’ If he is right, this is the only occurrence of this root. Otherwise, it is the only occurrence of the verb in the Qal. The general idea of כִּפֵּר seems to be ‘to atone by offering a substitute’ or ‘to appease by a gift,’ (Harris 1999:452-453), but there can also be the connotation of ‘ransom’ or ‘wiping away’ (cf. Averbeck 1997:691). These meanings need not be mutually exclusive (Averbeck 1997:691) but there is a continuing debate regarding the exact shade of meaning (Averbeck 1997:692).

¹³⁷ Gesenius (2003b) says that the word means ‘perversity, depravity’ and defines it further as ‘a depraved action, a crime, a sin’ and even ‘any thing unjustly acquired.’ The word can designate ‘civil ... social ...’ or ‘cultic violations’ or may summarise the totality of a person’s or nation’s infractions against God (Schultz 1999:651). See also note 67 above.

¹³⁸ Cf. Young 1949:199, who believes that the three expressions ultimately refer back to Gn 3 and this last one to the removal of the curse by Christ on the cross.

iniquities which were mentioned in the prayer. He writes: ‘The implication is that the end will be at once retributive and redemptive. The purveyor of “the transgression,” the foreign perpetrator of the sin, will be destroyed, but redemption will also come for people who have already suffered for their iniquities’ (Seow 2003:147).

The fourth clause, וְלָהֲבִיא צְדָקָה עֲלֵמִים, which is unique in the OT (Lacocque 1979:192), may perhaps be considered as one of the results of the removal of sin expressed in the previous three clauses: ‘to bring in everlasting (or perpetual) righteousness.’ The plural עֲלֵמִים is relatively rare in the MT (only nine times in more than 400 occurrences of עוֹלָם),¹³⁹ but appears frequently in the DSS¹⁴⁰ and in post-biblical literature where it seems to be used ‘with an intensive force’ (Tomasino 1997:350; Jenni 1997:854). This is perhaps also the intention in the present verse.¹⁴¹

Here in Daniel עוֹלָם is used in conjunction with צְדָקָה, ‘righteousness’ (cf. note 76 above on צְדָקָה in v. 7). Goldingay (1991:259) observes that צְדָקָה (‘vindication’ in his translation) ‘recalls the use in the prayer of צְדִיק/צְדָקָה ... which denoted the idea that Yahweh was in the right over against Israel.’ He suggests therefore that ‘bringing in righteousness thus suggests causing right to be acknowledged’ but also that one can connect this with the ‘vindication of the sanctuary in 8:12-14.’ Porteous (1965:140) opines that the phrase corresponds to the ‘curbing or ending of rebellion’ in the first trio of expressions and that it basically means ‘the triumph of the righteousness of God which includes the idea of salvation... and doubtless implies the responsive righteousness of the people.’

As a Christian interpreter, one cannot but see an allusion to the cross in the phrase (cf. Gesenius 2003b:612; Walvoord 1971:222). Baldwin (1978:169) observes that as Daniel had realised that only God is righteous (cf. 9:7, צְדָקָה; 9:14, צְדִיק), the promise to ‘bring in everlasting righteousness’ leaves but ‘a short step to justification by faith.’ Wood (1973:249-50) states that ‘righteousness is the opposite of sin.’ He argues that through Christ’s sacrifice on the cross, not only was sin removed (the issue at stake in the first

¹³⁹ The basic meaning of עוֹלָם is ‘most distant time,’ includes the idea of perpetuity (Jenni 1997:853), and does not necessarily convey our modern idea of ‘eternity’ in the sense of a limitless time-span, especially when referring to the past (cf. Macrae 1999:672).

¹⁴⁰ One hundred fifty four of the more than seven hundred occurrences of the root in the DSS are plural. See e.g. 1QS 2:3-4, 23, 25; 4:22 where it refers to covenant (cf. Lacocque 1979:192-193).

¹⁴¹ The singular is often used in covenant contexts (e.g. with Noah, Abraham, Phinehas, David; cf. Tomasino 1997:349): the covenants God initiates are עוֹלָם, ‘perpetual’ or ‘eternal.’ Tomasino (1997:349) argues that the ‘use of *‘ōlām* in these cases does not mean that the covenants could never be abrogated’ but that ‘it means that they were made with no anticipated end point.’ It would seem to me, though, that while humans can ‘abrogate’ a covenant by disobedience or disloyalty, God himself would never abrogate any covenant he made on his part. In addition, covenant renewal after such a breach by humans was always a possibility. In fact, in conditional covenants the conditions (e.g. circumcision, Gn 17) as well as the covenants themselves are described as ‘*‘ōlām*.’

three clauses) but also the way open ‘for righteousness to be granted’ (Wood 1973:250). The term עֲלָמִים, ‘everlasting,’ is significant in that while in the past Israel had had a history of continuous unfaithfulness, interspersed with brief periods of return to God, this future turning to God would be permanent (Wood 1973:250). Walvoord (1971:222) also thinks that ‘everlasting righteousness’ refers to Christ, but believes that ultimately the reference may be to the second coming rather than the first.

The phrase וְלִהְיוּ הַזִּוּן וְנִבְיָא can be translated ‘to seal vision and prophecy,’ though more literally the last word is ‘prophet.’ The question is whether הָתֵם in this context means ‘to seal’ in the sense of ‘closing off,’ or ‘to seal’ in the sense of ‘putting a mark of authenticity’ (which seems to be the more frequent meaning in the OT, according to a word study I conducted). In Daniel the word occurs in the present verse (twice, if the phrase לְהִתָּם הַטָּאוֹת is accepted as the correct reading), and in Daniel 12:4 and 9, there each time referring to the ‘closing up’ of Daniel’s prophecy. In the present context, both interpretations make sense: the word could either mean that ‘vision and prophecy’ are authenticated or that they are ‘closed up,’ i.e. that there will no longer be other visions and prophecies (cf. Keil & Delitzsch 1996:721; Lacocque 1979:193; Young 1949:200; Steinmann 2008:466 et. al.), though in my opinion the former is more natural in the context of Daniel 9. Goldingay (1991:259) supports this view, suggesting that the word ‘recalls 8:26’ where Daniel is told to ‘keep the vision secret’ (NASB; the Hebrew word used there is סָתַם) as well as Daniel 12:4, 9 and 6:18 (where the Aramaic הָתֵם is used). He argues against the interpretation that vision and prophecy will cease to exist (rightly, I think), noting that such an interpretation appears to be more eisegesis than exegesis (Goldingay 1991:260). He believes that ‘the promise is that Jeremiah’s prophecy will be fulfilled and thus confirmed’ (Goldingay 1991:260; cf. Gowan 2001:133; Lucas 2002:242). Collins (1993:354) also implies that to ‘seal’ here means to authenticate,’ and refers to the metaphorical use of the phrase ‘seal up’ in the NT where it implies divine approval.¹⁴² Like Goldingay he suggests that the ‘immediate referent is Jeremiah’s prophecy,’ but he adds that ‘the allusion probably includes all prophecy that is construed as eschatological.’

The last phrase וְלִמְשַׁח קִדְּשׁ קִדְּשֵׁי is literally ‘and to anoint holiness of holinesses’ or, with Goldingay (1991:229) ‘sacredness of sacrednesses.’ Theoretically, the phrase קִדְּשׁ קִדְּשֵׁי could refer either to the temple in Jerusalem or to a person who is anointed, perhaps

¹⁴² Collins (1993:354) refers to John 3:33; 6:27. In 2 Corinthians 1 two words are used that occur also in Daniel 9:24: ‘Now He who establishes us with you in Christ and *anointed* us is God, who also *sealed* us and gave us the Spirit in our hearts as a pledge’ (2 Cor 1:21-22; NASB). In Theodotion the last two phrases in Daniel 9:24 use the same words as Paul for ‘anoint’ (χρίω) and ‘seal’ (σφραγίζω). Paul states that God *anoints* Christians and *seals* them – presumably as a mark of approval or ownership; I believe that the same applies to the use of ‘seal’ in Daniel 9:24.

a priest (cf. 1 Chr 23:13). If a person is in view, the text may be interpreted messianically, though not everyone would agree with this. Each position has its proponents. Goldingay (1991:260) argues that the expression קֹדֶשׁ קְדוֹשִׁים refers to the Holy of Holies that had been defiled by Antiochus and was now going to be re-consecrated. He does not believe that there may be secondary references to either the people of Israel or to Christ. Fitzmyer (2007:62-63, n. 18) also sees a reference to the temple, arguing that the expressions that accompany $\text{וְלְמִשְׁכַּן קְדוֹשׁ קְדוֹשִׁים}$, namely ‘and for your holy city’ (v. 24) and ‘to rebuild Jerusalem’ (v. 25) definitely refer to a place, namely the Holy of Holies, especially in view of the fact that sacred places and objects were anointed in the OT.¹⁴³ Collins (1993:353), as noted above, suggests that the six infinitives of this verse together ‘constitute an eschatological ideal,’ though he does not believe that this and the following verses should be interpreted messianically.

Young (1949:200-201) on the other hand argues that the expression refers to a person, which is substantiated by the fact that ‘the phrase occurs without the definite article, [i.e.] it means *a most holy thing*.’ Young (1949:201) further suggests that what is meant is ‘the communication of the Spirit to Christ’ at his baptism which was the ‘distinguishing characteristic of the Messiah.’ Steinmann (2008:467) also believes that $\text{קְדוֹשׁ קְדוֹשִׁים}$ refers to Christ, noting that in verse 26 the sanctuary is only called קְדוֹשׁ , which he thinks probably ‘distinguishes the temple, which “will be destroyed,” from the “Most Holy One” in 9:24, who, though “cut off” (9:26), will be raised and live forevermore.’ Lacocque (1979:193ff) too sees a messianic reference in this expression, though not pointing to Christ, but a priest. While acknowledging that normally the expression $\text{קְדוֹשׁ קְדוֹשִׁים}$ ‘refers to a material object, altar, or Temple,’ he argues that in view of 1 Chronicles 23:13 ‘the expression should perhaps be interpreted in a personal sense: Aaron himself being referred to as the “Holy of Holies”’ (Lacocque 1979:193). He further notes that the structure of Daniel 9:24-26 supports this interpretation as each of the three sections into which the seventy weeks are divided ends ‘with mention of an event concerning the “messiah” (or “anointed one”)’ (Lacocque 1979:194). Lacocque believes that the author of the present chapter ‘has a plainly priestly conception of history and eschatology’ and that his “messianic” expectation is centred on the person of the High Priest’ or ‘anointed leader’ (Lacocque 1979:194, referring to v. 25). He notes that ‘the term “prince” (= chief) serves to designate a high personage’ which points to the ‘exaltation of the priesthood at the expense of the royal power. Therefore we rediscover the cautious, yet present, messianism of the Author’ (Lacocque 1979:194-195).

¹⁴³ For his view on verse 25 see below.

Meadowcroft (2001:437-438) argues that the term קֹדֶשׁ קְדוֹשִׁים is reconceptualised in the OT from a pure reference to the Holy of Holies of the tabernacle or temple in early texts to include land in Ezekiel 43:12, 45:3 and 48:12 (in these scriptures the phrase is also indefinite, as in Daniel), so that it is ‘something bigger than the temple but represented by the temple’ (Meadowcroft 2001:438). He then points out that in 1QS 8:1-10 the term appears twice, describing ‘the Council of the Community as “an assembly of the holy of holies”’ (Meadowcroft 2001:438, his translation of 1QS 8:5-6) and a couple of lines later ‘as a “most holy dwelling”’ (1QS 8:8; Meadowcroft 2001:438). In other words, the phrase קודש קודשים refers here actually not to a place, but ‘to a group of people whose identity is understood through the metaphor of the temple or sanctuary and the sacrificial system therein’ (Meadowcroft 2001:439). Meadowcroft (2001:440) further suggests that the term משיח likewise may refer not to a single person, but to a group of people, and concludes that in Daniel 9 as well as at Qumran ‘the anointed holy of holies is no longer understood in purely physical terms’ but ‘is a concept made concrete in the community, and occasionally in representative individuals or smaller groups within the community’ (Meadowcroft 2001:444). This opens the way for a messianic interpretation of these verses, as for example advanced by Gurney (1980:110ff) and Steinmann (2008:468ff), though perhaps sometimes these references are considered to be more precise than the text in fact permits.

A very different suggestion that deserves mention is that of Avalos (1998), who believes that there is a parallel to ANE temple inscriptions in the wording of Daniel 9:24, which talks about the anointing of the ‘most holy.’ The inscription of Esarhaddon which mentions seventy years of punishment before the rebuilding of a temple to Marduk is well known (Avalos 1998:507), but a much older inscription from the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I (1260-1232 BCE) contains a reference to an unnamed future prince who, the inscription predicts, will renew and repair the destroyed temple (the destruction is anticipated in the inscription) and finally anoint it (Avalos 1998:508-509). This is a very interesting parallel to Daniel 9. Avalos (1998:510) observes that though Daniel 9:24-25 ‘does not explicitly order the prince himself to rebuild or anoint the temple, both Daniel and the Akkadian examples associate these hopes for restoration with an *anonymous future prince*’ (italics added). For someone acquainted with such inscriptions, the phrase ‘until the time of an anointed prince’ (Dn 9:25) would not have been strange at all (Avalos 1998:510). Furthermore, Avalos (1998:511) explains that in Mesopotamia the temple inscriptions were anointed, while in Biblical practice parts of the temple and its paraphernalia were consecrated with oil. He suggests that ‘this would not exclude anointing an inscription or part of the Hebrew temple that is analogous to what receives the oil in the Mesopotamian temples,’ and concludes that the author of Daniel 9:24-25 may well have been cognisant of such old traditions and thus the writer adapted them to fit his context (Avalos 1998:511).

What is significant here is the fact that an old *Mesopotamian* tradition has been adapted. This could indicate that, if Avalos' suggestion is correct, the provenance of these verses may well be Mesopotamian, as the setting mentioned in Daniel 9:1-2 indicates, rather than Judean. It may therefore also be a much older tradition than that assumed by scholars who advocate a second-century dating for this chapter, and support an earlier dating.

Perhaps the fact that the last phrase, *קִדְּשׁוּן קִדְּשֵׁי*, can be interpreted either as a reference to a place (more likely) or a person (possible, but perhaps initially not so likely) should receive more attention. Whether a sixth or second century date is in view, initially the reference seems to have been to the Jerusalem Temple that lay derelict (sixth century) or was desecrated (second century). However, this may not be the only possible interpretation. The text is sufficiently ambiguous to allow other (re)applications. Already at Qumran we find the idea that the sect considered themselves as 'an assembly of the holy of holies,' a temple (Meadowcroft 2001:438), an idea taken up and applied to the church by Paul in 1 Corinthians 3:16-17 and applied to individual believers in 1 Corinthians 6:19. Jesus called himself 'the temple' in John 2:19, 21. Baldwin (1978:169, arguing for a sixth century dating) suggests, rightly in my opinion, that the verse 'is speaking of the accomplishment of God's purpose for all history.' Initially, perhaps, the reference was to the Jerusalem Temple that needed to be rededicated, 'but the Lord's anointed was ultimately to be a man ... who was the subject of "vision and prophet"' (Baldwin 1978:169). With the coming of Christ, this prophecy began to be fulfilled, but even now Christians are waiting for the consummation at the second coming of Christ which is still in the future. Baldwin (1978:169) concludes that '[i]f the historical work of Christ and His second coming are telescoped this is not unusual, even in the New Testament.'

To sum up, three of the clauses in Daniel 9:24 all deal in one way or another with the issue of sin, and, as the last of the three terms seems to imply, include its removal and/or forgiveness (cf. Gowan 2001:133). Whether they all say the same thing in different words or whether there is progression from the first to the third clause is debatable. They are, however, related to Daniel's prayer (cf. Lucas 2002:241; Gowan 2001:132), which acknowledged and confessed Israel's sin against God throughout the centuries, though some scholars see a reference to Antiochus here (e.g. Collins 1993:354, who suggests that 'the idea is that evil must run its course until the appointed time'). The two views are not necessarily mutually exclusive.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁴ Goldingay (1991:259) rightly notes that the whole text is ambiguous; its function is to make the reader question 'what relationship between calamity, confession and promise obtains between us and God.' Whether it refers to Israel or Antiochus is not the point, but the 'sacrilege of the sanctuary ... is Gabriel's concern.'

The result, so it seems, of the first three clauses is what is described in the last three: ‘to bring everlasting righteousness, and to authenticate vision and prophet/prophecy, and to anoint the most holy’ (my translation, but cf. NASB; Gowan 2001:133). At least the first of these, ‘everlasting righteousness,’ was obviously not fulfilled in the second century BCE. Neither, for that matter, was the removal of sin in its various forms dealt with then. It appears that the reference to ‘everlasting’ at the beginning of this set of three clauses indicates something more than the immediate future of Daniel and his readers (regardless of whether a 5th century or 2nd century setting is envisaged). As noted above, I believe that the second of this set of three clauses points to the authentication, i.e. verification, of the vision(s) and prophets/prophecies Daniel has been studying (cf. Gowan 2001:133), not the end of prophetic inspiration. Finally, the deliberate ambiguity of the phrase ‘to anoint the most holy’ leaves open the possibility that more than the restoration of the Jerusalem temple may be in view and that a messianic interpretation, and a reference to Christ, is possible, even likely.

2.3.3.3.2 Daniel 9:25

Verse 25 begins with another injunction to Daniel to ‘know and understand’ (וְתִדְעַ וְתִשְׁכַּל), indicating that more detailed information regarding the seventy sevens is about to be given. Daniel is to ‘know and understand’ that ‘from the going forth of the word to restore/return and (re)build Jerusalem until/to an anointed one, a prince/leader [there will be] seven weeks and sixty-two weeks¹⁴⁵ and it will again be built, a plaza and a moat, but in oppressive times’ (my translation; מִן־מִצְאָ דָבָר לְהָשִׁיב וְלִבְנוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם עַד־מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד שְׁבַעִים שָׁבָעָה (וְשִׁבְעֵים וָשָׁנָיִם וְשָׁנָיִם תָּשׁוּב וְנִבְנְתָה רְחֹב וְחָרוֹץ וּבְצֹק הָעֵתִים). The word לְהָשִׁיב could mean either ‘restore’ or ‘return.’ In the former case, it refers to the rebuilding of Jerusalem; in the latter it envisages the return of the Jewish exiles to their homeland. The content of the ‘word’ (or perhaps better, ‘decree’) that went out apparently concerns the rebuilding of the city of Jerusalem, though when this ‘word’ was given is a matter of scholarly debate. Lucas (2002:242) gives the options: Jeremiah’s prophecies (either 25:12, i.e. 605 BCE; or 29:10, 597 BCE; or 30:18-22; 31:38-40, i.e. 587 BCE); Gabriel’s words to Daniel or Cyrus’

¹⁴⁵ The translation is left deliberately ambiguous. The RSV, taking the *atnach* under שָׁבָעָה as a disjunctive accent, translates: ‘... from the going forth of the word to restore and build Jerusalem to the coming of an anointed one, a prince, there shall be *seven weeks*. Then for sixty-two weeks it shall be built again ...’ (italics added). Tanner (2009:325) however thinks that this translation is not convincing. He argues that the *atnach* is not necessarily a disjunctive accent, but may be indicating emphasis or clarification (Tanner 2009:327-328). In addition, the ancient Greek translations (LXX, Theodotion, Symmachus) and the Peshitta all treat the 7 and 62 weeks ‘as a single period’ (Tanner 2009:326). Hence he prefers the traditional translations (e.g. NASB: ‘... from the issuing of a decree to restore and rebuild Jerusalem until Messiah the Prince *there will be seven weeks and sixty-two weeks*; it will be built again...;’ bold print added). He also believes that the part of the verse indicating the rebuilding of the city is reflected in the seven weeks rather than the sixty-two weeks (Tanner 2009:328).

decree in Ezra 1:1-4 (ca. 539 BCE); Darius' decree (Ezr 6:1-12, 521 BCE); or Artaxerxes' decree (Neh 2:7-8; ca. 445 BCE). Steinmann (2008:458) however believes that the 'word' refers to Gabriel's speech to Daniel here (cf. Dn 9:23, 'At the beginning of your prayer, a word went out;' my translation). This is possible, but in view of the context of the prayer, it is in my opinion more likely that one of Jeremiah's prophecies is in view (29:10, or 30:18-22/31:38-40; cf. Lucas 2002:243 and his arguments against the other dates). It appears that from Daniel's viewpoint the issuing of the 'word' 'to (re)build Jerusalem' is still in the future. However, Daniel is assured that such a decree will indeed be issued, but that even then Jeremiah's prophecy will only be partly fulfilled in that though the city will be rebuilt, times of hardship will still be upon the people. Gooding (1981:66) argues similarly, noting that the reason for the merely partial fulfilment of Jeremiah's prophecy is Israel's continued persistence in sin; only true repentance will lead to the full restoration of the city.

Who is meant by the phrase מְשִׁיחַ נָגִיד is disputed. The expression is unique in the MT. Both words are masculine singular absolute (according to the MT pointing), and there is no definite article; hence my translation 'an anointed one, a prince/leader' or possibly 'an anointed prince/leader.' The word מְשִׁיחַ refers most often to a king¹⁴⁶ (cf. Oswalt 1997:1126; Hamilton 1999:531; e.g. 1 Sm 12:3, Saul; 1 Sm 16:6, David; Is 45:1 Cyrus, a pagan king), but an anointed one can also be a priest (e.g. Lv 4:3), a prophet (1 Ki 19:16), one of the Patriarchs (1 Chr 16:22; Ps 105:15), or even the people of God as a whole (Hab 3:13). The word never appears in the Pentateuch or in the major prophets (with the exception of the reference to Cyrus in Isaiah), which seems to indicate that the idea of a coming eschatological messiah was a growing one in Israel and apparently did not appear before 700 BCE (cf. Fitzmyer 2000:79; he argues, however, that the notion is not pre-second century).

The referent of the word נָגִיד is also unclear. In earlier biblical books (Samuel and Kings) the term always refers to Israelite kings (for whom the title מֶלֶךְ is sometimes deliberately avoided, e.g. 1 Sm 9-10; 2 Sm. 7), but in late biblical books the word can refer to religious leaders as well.¹⁴⁷ This is significant for the study of the word in Daniel where

¹⁴⁶ Fitzmyer (2000:76) notes that the basic meaning of the word is 'that such a historical ruler is or was an anointed agent of God designated for guidance, governance, or deliverance of his people.'

¹⁴⁷ References to kings are as follows: Saul (1 Sm 9:16; 10:1), David (implicitly 1 Sm 13:14; Is 55:4; 1 Chr 5:2; 2 Chr 6:5; explicitly 1 Sm 25:30; 2 Sm 5:2; 7:8; 1 Chr 11:2; 17:7; 28:4), Solomon (1 Ki 1:35; 1 Chr 29:22) or one of the successors of Solomon either in the northern or the southern kingdom (Jeroboam 1 Ki 14:7; 1 Ki 16:2 Baasha; 1 Ki 20:5 Hezekiah; 2 Chr 11:22 Abijah). The word is used for a member of the priesthood for the first time in Jeremiah (Pashhur Jr 20:1), and in Nehemiah and Chronicles it quite frequently (though not always) refers to a religious leader or priest (1 Chr 9:11,20; 12:28 [Eng. 27]; 26:24 keepers of the Temple treasury; 2 Chr 31:12, 13; 35:8; Ne 11:11). It can designate rulers of other nations (king of Tyre Ezk 28:2; leaders of the Assyrian army 2 Chr 32:21) as well as political rulers or leaders of Israel in general (Ps 76:13; Pr 28:16; 1 Chr 13:1; 27:4 leaders of the army; 1 Chr

it occurs three times, here in Daniel 9:25 and 26, and in 11:22 where the enigmatic expression ‘prince of the covenant’ is used.

Many Christians take the combination ‘an anointed one, a leader’ in Daniel 9:25 as a reference to Jesus Christ, the Messiah. However, this is challenged by other interpreters who argue that the reference here is not to Christ, but to a high priest, often identified as Onias III (e.g. Gowan 2001:135). Aitken (1997:20) suggests that in Daniel 11:22 the reference is probably to Onias III, but that here in Daniel 9:25 it is uncertain whether the person designated ‘anointed ruler’ (מְשִׁיחַ נְגִיד) ‘is a priestly or a royal figure.’ Fitzmyer (2007:63) too notes that a decision in this regard is not easy, but ultimately prefers a ‘kingly Messiah’ in this context, ‘someone like Zerubbabel’ (especially since he assumes a second century date).¹⁴⁸ Slotki (1951:78) agrees that מְשִׁיחַ probably refers to a king, in his opinion to Cyrus, while נְגִיד, referring to ‘a title of the highest rank,’ here ‘appears to indicate the High Priest.’ Hartman and Di Lella (1978:251) contend that an identification of the מְשִׁיחַ with Cyrus is unlikely since Daniel ‘is less interested in the political history of Judah than in the history of its religious cult.’ In their opinion the ‘anointed prince’ of Daniel 9:25 is a religious leader, probably Joshua ben Jozadak, the high priest who returned to Jerusalem, together with Zerubbabel and the first returning exiles (537 BCE; Hartman and Di Lella 1978:251), a view also held by Porteous (1965:142) and Collins (2010c:42).

Doukhan (1979:11) sees a connection between the present verse and Exodus 29:36-37 where the notions of ‘atonement (*kpr*), anointing (*mšḥ*) and holy of holies (*qōdēš qodāšîm*)’ appear in conjunction, according to Doukhan the only text apart from Daniel 9 where this is the case. He argues that because the text deals with the anointing of Aaron’s sons to the priesthood, the ‘holy of holies’ in Daniel refers to ‘the consecration of a new high-priesthood’ (Doukhan 1979:12). However, if Exodus 29:36-37 is read carefully, these two verses actually refer to the *altar* of the tabernacle as the ‘holy of holies,’ not the priests or even the high-priest, which makes Doukhan’s suggestion somewhat questionable, at least in terms of direct connection between the two texts. If there is a connection, it seems that the reference in Daniel, like that in Exodus, is to a thing, i.e. the temple, or more narrowly, the altar, just as Exodus refers to the altar, rather than a person.

27:16 leaders of tribes, also 2 Chr 19:11; 2 Chr 11:11 officers in charge of fortresses; 2 Chr 28:7). The word may be used for ‘noble’ people or things (Jb 29:10; 31:7 prince; Pr 8:6 noble things). It only occurs twice in the DSS, at 4Q504 (4QDibHam^a) 17:8 where it is translated (in context) ‘princely shepherd’; and at 11Q5 (11QPs^a) 28:11 where it is translated ‘prince,’ and in fact is used in a context where בְּרִית also appears: ‘He set me as prince over his people [vacat] ^{ruler} over the people of his covenant’ (lines 11-12).

¹⁴⁸ Fitzmyer (2007:63) thinks that the reference to a מְשִׁיחַ in the next verse is to a different person. See below on verse 26.

Oswalt (1997:1125) opines that the ‘existence of the concept of “*The Anointed One*” (*māšīah*) in its own right, over and above the ... functions of prophet, priest and king, undoubtedly contributed to the rise of the concept of the *eschatological* Anointed One, the Messiah’ (italics added). He believes that Daniel 9:25 and 26 are the only unambiguous references to this figure, though not all scholars agree with this view. He writes: ‘Here Daniel predicts a time in the future when the Anointed One, who may well be The Most Holy who is anointed in 9:24, will appear and then be cut off with nothing’ (Oswalt 1997:1125). Similar sentiments are voiced by Hamilton (1999:531). Oswalt (1997:1125) claims that Jewish interpretation in the intertestamental period already understood Psalms references to the ‘anointed’ and references to an ideal Davidic king in the prophetic books as referring to an eschatological figure.¹⁴⁹ In the New Testament, Jesus was identified as that Anointed One, and with this hindsight one might argue that the references in the Old Testament were pointing towards Christ as well. However, Baldwin (1978:170) rightly notes that both מָשִׁיחַ and מָלִיךְ are far more general in Hebrew than might be suspected by an English reader, and that the term מָשִׁיחַ did not yet have the technical meaning ‘messiah’ in the OT.¹⁵⁰

In summary, a מָלִיךְ is simply a leader, and the context must decide whether a political or religious leader is referred to. The same applies to מָשִׁיחַ. Therefore one cannot necessarily argue for a messianic interpretation of this verse; however, such an interpretation should not be excluded offhand either. The fact that in late biblical books מָלִיךְ is used more frequently for religious leaders may point to the fact that here too a religious leader is in view, but one cannot be dogmatic either way.¹⁵¹

The division of the seventy weeks of years into seven, sixty-two and one (which in turn is divided into two halves), is intriguing and has resulted in a wealth of scholarly material. It was suggested above that these numbers be taken symbolically or at least as round numbers, rather than literally or numerically accurate figures¹⁵² because calculations

¹⁴⁹ Green & Silverstein (2014) mention that ‘Jewish texts from [the] biblical through the post-70 periods illustrate a progressive idealization of the future “anointed” king.’ Ginsberg (2007:110-111) speaks of a three-stage development that runs through the HB, but this is in his opinion only the prehistory of the ‘postbiblical idea of “the Messiah”’ (Ginsberg (2007:111) which began in the Second Temple period. See also the following note.

¹⁵⁰ Similar statements are also made by others. Soggin (1997:676) for example states: ‘A specifically eschatological-messianic significance of the title [*māšīah*] is not yet discernible in the OT, not even in Isa 45:1.’ Ginsberg (2007:110) notes that ‘a charismatically endowed descendant of David’ as Messiah ‘is a strictly postbiblical concept.’ Green & Silverstein (2014) observe: ‘[T]he HB contains no doctrine of an eschatological redeemer and does not use the term “messiah” to refer to one.’

¹⁵¹ Laato (1990:222) similarly argues that ‘the identity of the Anointed Prince must be left open,’ though she thinks it more likely that a priestly figure (i.e. a High Priest) is in view here.

¹⁵² This is particularly in view of the fact that ‘one year’ could indicate either a 360 day year (the normal Jewish reckoning) or a 364-day year (Qumran reckoning). If one takes the numbers literally, the question then would be, especially if a second-century date for Daniel is assumed, which calendar the author adhered to and advocated in the reckoning of the seventy weeks of years. Interpretations that build on precise calendar dates, assuming a 365¼ day solar year, would then be at least questionable.

that are based on the literal meaning are not satisfactory in terms of the beginning and end points to be considered. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that it is easier to argue for this type of symbolic interpretation for the total, seventy, and the first and last divisions, seven and one, than it is for the apparently rather exact figure sixty-two, which does not easily lend itself to symbolic interpretation. Perhaps the meaning is that after a relatively short period of seven sevens, a very long period of time (the 62 sevens) elapses before a concluding cataclysm which is even shorter (one seven) (cf. Meadowcroft 2001:433 for a similar reasoning), and itself divided into two parts of equal length. Scholars have advanced different arguments when interpreting these numbers, but two of these stand out.

Instone-Brewer (1991) suggests that the numerical values in Daniel 7-12 may be based on the 'writing on the wall' in chapter 5. He argues (Instone-Brewer 1991:315-316) that the

original writing on the wall may have been the cuneiform marks "|||+", which could be the scratches made by the fingers of a left hand as it curled up into a fist. This could be read as 60, 60, 1, ½, or "*Mina, Mina, Shekel, Peresh*". This supposition would explain why the other wise men could not read the writing and why the text says that it was written with "fingers" and not "a finger".

Instone-Brewer (1991:315) suggests that the number $3\frac{1}{2}$ is 'the simplest interpretation of these marks,' reading '|||+' as '1, 1, 1, ½.' He adds that 'the visions [of Daniel 7:25 and 12:7 are] based on the number $3\frac{1}{2}$ [and] were meditations on this initial revelation.' In Daniel 5, 'Daniel explored their value as $121\frac{1}{2}$. The visionary chapters (7-12) explore the other two possible values of $3\frac{1}{2}$ and $62\frac{1}{2}$ ' (Instone-Brewer 1991:315-316). The present chapter would seem to be the exploration of the last possibility, i.e. reading the first full stroke as 60, the second and third each as 1 and the + as ½, in addition to being a meditation on Jeremiah. If this is right, it would also render untenable Hartman and DiLella's position that Daniel did not have an accurate knowledge of the time periods at all but that, being concerned mainly with the last seven years (one week) he basically made up the divisions into seven, sixty two and one week in order to arrive at a total of seventy weeks (Hartman & DiLella 1978:250).¹⁵³ The problem with this view is that the number then is not 62 but $62\frac{1}{2}$.

Dimant (1993:62) also disagrees with scholars who argue that the author of Daniel 9 had 'only an imprecise knowledge of history' since the accuracy of chapters 10-12 does not warrant this conclusion (Dimant 1993:63; cf. Laato 1990:215). Rather, like

¹⁵³ Especially since, even if the *terminus a quo* for the 490-year period is 605 BCE, this would only amount to 441 years to the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, not 490.

other scholars before her,¹⁵⁴ she suggests that the three divisions (into 7, 62, and 1 week respectively) in Daniel may not be strictly sequential, but partly overlapping and that furthermore one should not think in precise arithmetical values (i.e. 49, 434, and 7) but rather in sabbatical cycles which were observed during the Second Temple period (Dimant 1993:63).¹⁵⁵ She proceeds to outline the structure of these cycles in the *Animal Apocalypse*, the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, and *Jubilees* (Dimant 1993:64-68), all beginning in her opinion in 604/3 BCE, and concludes that a similar framework may apply to Daniel. Dimant (1993:68) thinks that Daniel's seventy weeks may also be calculated from 604/3 BCE, which is the 'middle of the seventieth jubilee from the Creation of the world, ... [which] falls within the seventh Week, which [in turn] marks the transition from history proper to the dawn of the final Eschaton.' The disadvantage of this interpretation is that it is dependent on a particular date. Therefore I believe Instone-Brewer's suggestion has more weight, but in view of the ambiguity of the text one cannot be dogmatic.

The last phrase in verse 25, 'it will again be built, a plaza and a moat, but in oppressive times' (my translation; תָּשׁוּב וְנִבְנְתָה רְחֹב וְחֲרוֹץ וּבְצֹק הָעֵתִים), 'is a rich and suggestive phrase that combines reference to the restoring of the community and the rebuilding of the city' (Goldingay 1991:260). It indicates that the whole city, including streets, open places and protective systems (חֲרוֹץ)¹⁵⁶ would be rebuilt (cf. Goldingay 1991:261; Hartman & DiLella 1978:244). 'Times of distress' may refer primarily to the difficulties that the Jews faced in rebuilding the city and temple after their return from exile, but there may well have been other times of distress later on in the city's history and before the times of Antiochus Epiphanes of which no record has been preserved and which would have been just as obscure to the author of the chapter as it is to modern historians (Hartman & DiLella 1978:251).

2.3.3.3.3 Daniel 9:26

Verse 26 is just as obscure as the previous one, and scholars have struggled to make sense of it and the following verse (cf. Hartman & DiLella 1978:245 on vv. 26-27). Goldingay (1991:226) takes the last phrase of verse 25, 'in pressing/distressing times' as the beginning of a new sentence that continues into verse 26. He translates these verses: 'But

¹⁵⁴ She refers in particular to Wacholder (1975:206-208).

¹⁵⁵ She notes that 'the presence of lists of sabbatical cycles at Qumran suggests that such detailed records were kept at least by some circles during the Second Temple Era' and purports that such timetables 'were taken as chronological framework for historical chronologies' (Dimant 1993:62).

¹⁵⁶ The word חֲרוֹץ means 'something cut.' Here it refers to 'a trench cut into the rock outside the city walls in order to increase the exterior height of the walls' (Hartman & DiLella 1978:244; cf. Lacocque 1979:188, 'entrenchment'). In the Copper Scroll the word appears with a different spelling (חֲרִיץ) and the meaning 'conduit' (3Q15 V:8; Porteous 1965:142).

in the pressure of the times (that is, after the sixty-two sevens) an anointed will be cut off and will have neither the city nor the sanctuary. A leader to come will devastate a people, and its end will come with the flood. Until the end of battle desolations are determined.’ The NASB interprets the text messianically: ‘Then after the sixty-two weeks the Messiah will be cut off and have nothing, and the people of the prince who is to come will destroy the city and the sanctuary. And its end *will come* with a flood; even to the end there will be war; desolations are determined.’¹⁵⁷ It seems that however one translates this verse, after the sixty-two weeks, which are characterised by difficulties, a decisive event will happen in that ‘an anointed one will be cut off’ (יִכָּרֵת מְשִׁיחַ), which in the present context probably indicates his death.¹⁵⁸

The question of the identity of this anointed one also arises. Is he the same person as in verse 25, or a different one? In fact, the syntax of the sentence allows for either option: it is possible that he is the same person, but it is also possible that the מְשִׁיחַ in this verse is a different person altogether (cf. Goldingay 1991:262). Goldingay argues that since nouns in the visions are typically anarthrous, the effect of this feature is that it contributes ‘to that allusiveness appropriate to a vision, which cannot be resolved from within chap. 9 itself.’ He, like many others, identifies the מְשִׁיחַ as Onias III, whose being ‘cut off’ could be either his displacement or his death (Goldingay 1991:262). Goldingay (1991:262) writes: ‘His losing city and sanctuary sounds like a reference to his displacement and withdrawal for safety to Daphne, near Antioch (2 Macc 4:33); but his actual death in 171 B.C. marks the beginning of the seven years of trouble.’ However, due to the ambiguity of the grammar the messianic interpretation is not impossible and should not be dismissed out of hand.

The phrase לוֹ אֵין לֹ is problematic since it does not seem to make much sense in the context. It can be translated ‘and he has nothing’ or ‘there is nothing for him’ (Lucas 2002:230), but what does that mean? Van der Kooij (1993:501) proposes that the last anointed (high) priest will have no successor and that the remainder of verse 27 predicts Antiochus’ prohibition of sacrifices and oblations in the temple. Others think that a word has been left out, e.g. ‘judgment’ (דִּין; cf. Theodotion who adds the word ‘judgment’ here), ‘evil,’ עָוֹן, or ‘helper,’ עֵזֶר; this last in analogy to Daniel 11:45 ‘with no one to help him’ (cf. Collins 1993:346). Goldingay (1991:226) and Lucas (2002:227, 230) suggest with

¹⁵⁷ A series of footnotes indicates the difficulty in translating the text and alerts the reader to alternative interpretations.

¹⁵⁸ The Qal of כָּרַת is often used to express the making of a covenant. But the Niphal imperfect 3ms, ‘to be cut (off),’ can have the nuance of ‘not being present anymore, ceasing, lacking’ (e.g. Josh 9:23; 1 Ki 2:4), or simply to ‘be removed’ (Zech 14:2) without necessarily implying the death of the person in question. It is therefore possible that the term could mean a simple removal from office or otherwise of the ‘anointed one’ (cf. Jefferey & Kennedy 1956:496), thus giving credence to Goldingay’s translation. The more likely meaning in the context, however, and that adopted generally, is that of ‘kill,’ – no matter who the ‘anointed one’ is considered to be.

Ozanne (1965:447) that the punctuation of MT should be ignored and the phrase combined with the next one, resulting in *וְאֵין לוֹ וְהָעִיר וְהַקְדֹּשׁ*, thus reading the two waw-conjunctions as meaning ‘both ... and’ and translating with Goldingay as quoted above: ‘an anointed will be cut off *and will have neither the city nor the sanctuary.*’ This suggestion is of course possible, but seems to be too dependent on a certain view of the dating of the text. Perhaps a deliberate ambiguity was actually intended.

Those accepting a messianic interpretation consider the *מְשִׁיחַ* in this verse to be the same figure as that in verse 24 and as referring to Christ. However, there are again different opinions whether his birth or death is meant, though if it refers to Christ, in my opinion the latter is more likely, especially in view of the fact that he will be ‘cut off and have nothing.’¹⁵⁹ The rest of the verse is then often seen as referring to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in 70 CE, which I think makes more sense than a reference to Antiochus Epiphanes, who never really destroyed the city. Dispensationalists consider these verses (i.e. 24-27) as a reference to Christ’s second coming, and the time of the antichrist and the destruction he will bring about before the final coming of the Lord in glory.

The next phrase too is difficult: who destroys whom or what in *וְנִגְיַד הַבָּא עִם*? Who is the *נִגְיַד הַבָּא*? And should one read *עִם*, as MT or *עִמְּ* (‘with’), as Theodotion? On the whole, the argument for *עִם* (‘people’) seems to be more convincing, but the question is still whether the people destroy the leader to come, or whether the leader to come destroys the people, or whether the people of the leader to come are destroying the city and sanctuary as in the NASB reading. Gowan (2001:135) suggests that because Jerusalem was not destroyed by Antiochus, *שָׁחַת*¹⁶⁰ should be rendered ‘damaged,’ as this is one of the meanings the word can have elsewhere, and since this is supported by 1 Maccabees 1:20-35 and 2 Maccabees 5:11-21. This is not impossible, but in my opinion the remainder of the verse tilts the scale in favour of ‘destroy.’

‘And its/his end [will be] with/as a flood, and until the end [there will be] war; desolations are decreed’ (*וְקִצְוֹ בַּשֹּׁטָף וְעַד קֵץ מְלַחְמָה נִחְרָצֶת שְׁמָמוֹת*). This last part of the sentence, like the rest of Daniel 9:26, is open to different translations and interpretations.

¹⁵⁹ This is also advocated by Kline (1974:463) who believes that the verb *כָּרַת* used for messiah’s death is reminiscent of covenant language. The verb is often used for making a covenant ‘by a cutting ritual which portrayed the curse of the covenant oath’ (Kline 1974:463).

¹⁶⁰ In Daniel the word occurs in 8:24-25 (three times), in the present verse, 9:26, and in 11:17. The NASB translates the occurrences in chapter 8 and 9 ‘destroy’ and the one in Daniel 11:17 as ‘ruin’, but the footnote to 8:24-25 explains that what was translated ‘he will destroy to an extraordinary degree,’ ‘he will destroy mighty men’ and ‘he will destroy many’ could equally well be translated ‘corrupt’ in each case. In other words, these two verses may refer either to physical destruction or to mental destruction. No alternatives are suggested for the occurrences in chapters 9 and 11.

The first expression, וְאֵתֵּן, might be rendered ‘its end’ or ‘his end’, depending on whether one perceives a reference to a person (Antiochus Epiphanes, or more generally the ‘people of the prince to come’ or ‘the prince to come’) or to the sanctuary and the city (perceived as a unity; cf. Lucas 2002:244). Longman (1999:227) observes that the word ‘flood’ may indicate that this final devastation will not only be complete but also swift.

There are no finite verbs in this last clause; all of them are participles. One might render ‘until the end, war [and] desolation are decreed,’ or ‘unto the end of the decreed war/battle there will be desolations’ (Collins 1993:346), or even ‘unto the end war, decreed desolations.’ This last phrase, according to Baldwin (1978:171), ‘takes up the prayer of verse 18’ and suggests that ‘[i]n the long term no promise can be made that Jerusalem will be spared suffering; rather the truth is that suffering is inevitable.’ But what is meant by ‘end’? Because of its frequency in Daniel, a brief study of this word is in order.

2.3.3.3.4 Excursus: קָץ in the MT (with Special Reference to Daniel) and the DSS

The significance of the term קָץ for Daniel is evident in the fact that fifteen of the sixty-seven occurrences in the MT (i.e. 22%) appear in chapters 8-12, more than in any other biblical book.¹⁶¹ Twenty-one times the expression קָצֵה appears with an indefinite (Gn 4:3, יָמִים, days, i.e. after some time in the context) or a definite time expression (7/10/40 etc. days/years; i.e. after 7/10/40 etc. days/years).¹⁶² None of these are eschatological in nature, but refer to the end of a more or less specified, but limited period in time. The same applies to Nehemiah 13:6, 2 Chronicles 18:2, and Daniel 11:6 where, however, the expressions קָצֵה יָמִים and קָצֵה שָׁנִים occur which are used in the same sense as קָצֵה יָמִים, i.e. ‘after some time.’ It appears that in these later books the preposition is no longer לְ but מֵ, except where there is a quotation from Kings.¹⁶³

In Genesis 6:8 קָץ is used without preposition or suffix and appears for the first time in the context of God’s judgment (the flood) on humankind. Similar references to God’s judgment upon Israel are frequent in the prophets. Jeremiah and Ezekiel note that

¹⁶¹ In the Aramaic section, the equivalent word קצת appears three times, always referring to the end of a certain period of time.

¹⁶² Genesis 4:3; 8:6; 16:3; 41:1; Exodus 12:41; Numbers 13:25; Deuteronomy 9:11; 15:1; 31:10; Judges 11:39; 2 Samuel 14:26; 15:7; 1 Kings 2:39; 17:7; Isaiah 23:15, 17; Jeremiah 13:6; 34:14; 42:7; Ezekiel 29:13; 2 Chronicles 8:1.

¹⁶³ In Daniel 11:6 קָצֵה שָׁנִים refers to a particular period of time in the history of the kings of the north and south (cf. Talmon 2004:82): ‘after some years’ (NASB; וְקָצֵה שָׁנִים, lit. ‘at the end of [a few] years’). The same seems to apply to 11:13 (וְקָצֵה הַיָּמִים שָׁנִים; NASB: ‘after an interval of some years;’ lit. ‘at the end of times, years’).

At 2 Kings 19:23, Isaiah 37:24, Jeremiah 50:26 קָץ refers to a place. Isaiah 9:6 says that ‘there will be no end’ (אֵין קָץ) ‘to the increase of [Messiah’s] government or of peace’ (NASB). In Psalm 39:5 the psalmist asks God to remind him of his end, i.e. his death (cf. Job 6:11; Dn 11:45), but in Psalm 119:96, in Job and Ecclesiastes the word appears to be used in the sense of ‘limitation.’

Judah's end has come or is upon it: בָּא קֶצֶד (Jr 51:13); קָץ בָּא הַקָּץ (Ezk 7:2); הַקָּץ עָלֶיךָ (Ezk 7:3); קָץ בָּא בָּא בָּא הַקָּץ (Ezk 7:6). Other instances in Ezekiel refer to the time (עַתָּה)¹⁶⁴ of Israel's doom, lit. 'the time of the punishment of the end': בָּא יוֹמוֹ בְּעֵת עֲוֹן הַקָּץ (Ezk 21:30 [EV 21:5]; cf. 21:34 [EV 21:9]; 35:5; Amos 8:2, בָּא הַקָּץ אֶל-עַמִּי; Lam 4:18, קָרַב קִצְיָנוּ מְלֵאוֹ יְמֵינוּ כִּי-בָּא, (קִצְיָנוּ)).

Habakkuk 2:3 and the references in Daniel remain to be examined. Habakkuk 2:3 is important because it is closest in wording to the occurrences in Daniel: כִּי עוֹד הִזוֹן לְמוֹעֵד, 'For the vision is yet for the appointed time; it hastens (lit. pants) toward the goal (קָץ) and will not fail (lit. lie)' (NASB). Here, as in some instances in Daniel, קָץ occurs together with מוֹעֵד,¹⁶⁵ which is often used for a particular time or season, especially the Jewish festivals, hence the translation 'appointed time.' Like many other occurrences in the prophetic books, this text refers to God's judgment, both on Judah and later on Babylon, the instrument God would use to punish Judah. The prophet is assured that judgment will come, even if it seems to take a long time in Habakkuk's time frame; in God's, it is already determined and will come about at just the right time.

Though there are similarities to Habakkuk 2:3 and Ezekiel 21:30, 21:34 and 35:5 in Daniel, the way קָץ is used in this book is quite unique in several instances. The expression עַת־קָץ, for example, occurs only in Daniel. Moreover, except where the word is used with the 3ms pronominal suffix (9:26; 11:45), it is always indefinite.

The first two occurrences of קָץ in Daniel are at 8:17 (הֲבֵנוּ כְּ-רְאֻמָּה כִּי לְעַת־קָץ הִתְחַזֵּן), 'understand, son of man, that for a time of end/end time is the vision;' my translation) and 8:19 (הִנְנִי מוֹדִיעֶךָ אֵת אֲשֶׁר-יִהְיֶה בְּאַחֶרֶת הַיָּעַם כִּי לְמוֹעֵד קָץ), 'behold, I am making known to you what will be at the end of the indignation, since it is for an appointed time of end/end time;' my translation). In both instances, קָץ is combined with another time word (עַתָּה or מוֹעֵד), the expressions are indefinite (hence my translation 'end time'), and in the context of the following explanation of the vision, the reference seems to be to a time in the distant future, probably to an eschatological point in time (cf. Hill & Matties 1997:955; Wagner 1997:1156¹⁶⁶). As in the other prophetic writings, there is also an element of judgment in view (8:25). Hasslberger (1977:59), however, questions whether לְעַת־קָץ at 8:17 is an

¹⁶⁴ The first time this word is used in conjunction with קָץ, but the whole phrase is further modified by עֲוֹן.

¹⁶⁵ מוֹעֵד 'frequently designates a determined time or place without regard to the purpose of the designation' (Lewis 1999:388; cf. also Sauer (1997:553), who notes with reference to Daniel 8:19; 11:27 that 'The end of time is firmly established in advance').

¹⁶⁶ Daniel 'uses the word [קָץ] as a fixed technical term. ... This end may be calculated since it has been precisely predetermined by God (cf. Dan. 11:27; 12:7; 8:14; 12:12)' (Wagner 1997:1156). Wildgruber (2013:220) notes that this definition does not apply to Daniel 11:6, 13, 21 and 45, but Wagner does not list these verses under this definition anyway.

eschatological reference, and prefers to interpret Daniel 8:17, 19 as references to the end of the time of the present tribulation which the author envisages, though he admits that certainty is impossible. Talmon (2004:82) similarly does not think that Daniel 8:17, 19 refer to an eschatological time frame and lists these occurrences under the definition ‘historical period,’ i.e. ‘a specific span of time in the past or future.’

In Daniel 11:45 the form קצו (‘his end’) appears, i.e. the same grammatical form as Dn 9:26. In Daniel 11:45 it refers definitely to the death of the King of the North, as ‘his end’ will overtake him without there being anyone to help him (וְאֵין עֹזֵר לוֹ); cf. above on Ps 39:5, Job 6:11), but the context in Daniel 9:26 is too vague to decide with any kind of precision to whom or what the expression refers.

Daniel 11:27 and 35 are related most closely to the wording to Habakkuk 2:3. In 11:27 the two kings of the North and South will speak to each other deceitfully, but the deceit (of the King of the North) will not succeed ‘for [the] *end* [will] still [be] at the *appointed time*’ (my translation; בְּיַעֲוֹד קָץ לְמוֹעֵד; 11:27; cf. 8:19). Possibly this refers to the death of this person,¹⁶⁷ but perhaps more is intended. Daniel 11:35 speaks about some of those having insight falling so that they will be purged ‘until [the] time of [the] *end/end time*, for [it is] still for the appointed time’ (my translation; עַד־עֵת קָץ בְּיַעֲוֹד לְמוֹעֵד). Daniel 11:40 starts a new paragraph with a phrase (וּבְעֵת קָץ) that is almost identical to 8:17 (לְעֵת־קָץ; i.e. ל instead of ב, and no conjunction). In all these verses (i.e. Dn 8:17, 19; 11:27, 35, 40) קָץ seems to refer to the ‘apocalyptic end’, i.e. it is an eschatological term (cf. Wildgruber 2013:220-221). It is particularly significant that the expression עַת קָץ apparently always has such an eschatological connotation (8:17; 11:35, 40; 12:4, 9). Wildgruber (2013:221) notes: ‘Dieses Ende wird zu einer bestimmten Frist erwartet (V. 27d), es begrenzt die Zeit der Prüfung der Weisen (V. 35a) und trifft schließlich ein (V. 40a).’

In Daniel 12:4 the heavenly interpreter tells Daniel to seal the book he is writing ‘until [the] end of time’ (עַד־עֵת קָץ), so also in verse 9. In 12:13 Daniel is told to go his way to the end (לְקָץ), for he will rise again for his ‘allotted portion at the end of the age’ (לְגֵרָתָהּ; NASB). In Talmon’s opinion, only these last two occurrences of קָץ are eschatological (Talmon 2004:83), but as has been shown, the references in Daniel 8:17, 19 and 11:27, 35 and 40 also belong into this category (cf. Hill & Matties 1997:955; Wildgruber 2013:220-221). In particular the expression עַת קָץ seems to refer to an eschatological time frame.

¹⁶⁷ Wildgruber (2013:220) notes the verse refers to the ‘personal end’ of this king (‘persönliches Ende’).

Concerning the meaning of קץ in Daniel 9:26, Talmon (2004:82) believes that the phrase וְקִצְוֹ בְשִׁטָּף וְעַד קֵץ מִלְחָמָה in the context of the verse ‘is to be understood as referring to a historical period of devastating wars that mark the culmination of divine judgment.’ I would suggest that this is correct for וְקִצְוֹ בְשִׁטָּף, but that the second phrase, ‘until [the] end [there will be] war; desolations are decreed’ (וְעַד קֵץ מִלְחָמָה נִתְרָצָת שְׁמִימִוֹת), looks beyond a particular historical period, and includes an eschatological reference. As in Daniel 11-12, this eschatological end occurs together with the end of the last king (cf. Wildgruber 2013:224).

In the DSS קץ appears 203 times, meaning ‘time,¹⁶⁸ end, era’ (DSSEL glossary). Most occurrences refer to historical periods (Talmon 2004:85), and appear in phrases such as ‘time/era of wickedness/wrath/punishment’ (e.g. CD 1:5; 5:20 etc.). The meaning in the DSS is usually “‘span of time, historical period,” not “time” generally’ (Talmon 2004:83), and only rarely denotes ‘eschatological time’ (Talmon 2004:85). The word also refers to ‘fixed seasons of prayer or festal days’ (Talmon 2004:84), or to a ‘lifetime’ (Talmon 2004:85).

The expression ¹⁶⁹עַת קֵץ, which appears five times in Daniel as a standard term for eschatological time, occurs only twice in the DSS: once in 4Q285 (4QM) 9:2, which is too fragmentary to comment on;¹⁷⁰ and in 4Q372 (4QNarr and Poetic Comp^b) 1:14—15. This reads: ‘And in all this Joseph [was given] into the hands of foreigners, who were devouring his strength and breaking all his bones until *the time of the end* for him.’ Here the reference is to the end of a particular time frame for a particular person, not to the eschatological end. It is rather surprising that עַת קֵץ which occurs with a specialised meaning in Daniel appears only twice in documents generally believed to come from a similar time frame (i.e. around the second century BCE or later), and then only in rather obscure documents of which only fragments survive, not in the more important ones. Both words occur in the same line on only five more occasions, but not together to mean ‘time of the end.’

¹⁶⁸ Brin (2001:264-265) rightly observes that in the DSS קץ is ‘constantly used ... with reference to the subject of time, and ... with various connotations to time,’ whereas in the HB it mainly appears with ‘the sense of “end” in relation to various matters’ (Brin 2001:264), though it may also have the sense of ‘time’ (usually in late biblical literature). This latter use, so Brin (2001:264) ‘has a clear sequel and development in post-biblical literature and in the Scroll literature.’

¹⁶⁹ Gretler (2004:246) remarks that in Daniel the combination of two lexemes denoting time with קץ, such as עַת קֵץ (e.g. in Dn 8:17; 11:35, 40; 12:4, 9), מוֹעֵד קֵץ (as in Dn 8:19), קֵץ מִיָּמַיִן (Dn 12:13) as well as קֵץ alone (e.g. Dn 8:19; 11:27; 12:6, 13) denote the end time, i.e. the eschatological time of the end. Cf. also Wilch (1969:111), who remarks that only in Daniel’s apocalypse is ‘*eth*’ employed together with the concept of an absolute end of the world’s course of historical events,’ especially in ‘the genitive construction ‘*eth qets*’ which denotes ‘the absolute eschatological “End”.’

¹⁷⁰ In fact, only these two words are readable in the line.

Expressions similar to Daniel's 'time of the end' (עת קץ) are conveyed somewhat differently in the DSS and are not very frequent. Two of these are (ה)קץ (ה)אחרון ([the] time of [the] end; e.g. in 1QpHab 7:7, 12)¹⁷¹ and אחרית העת.¹⁷² Two other expressions that occur in the DSS use the word אחרית: either אחרית (ל or ה)קץ (once each, in 4Q169 (4QpNah) 3-4iii:3 – 'end of time' – and 4Q173 (4QpPs^b) 1:5 – 'last period') or in reverse word order קץ אחרית (5Q16, an unclassified fragment where these are the only two readable words, both having been reconstructed without a translation being offered), and אחרית הימים, translated 'the end of days/ the last days' or 'the latter days.' This latter expression is far more common than any of the others, appearing twenty-six times and always together, with or without a preposition.¹⁷³ This seems to be the standard expression in the DSS for the eschatological 'last days.'

In contrast, in many of the biblical occurrences the reference of the phrase בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים is to some distant time in the future, usually to the exile or its end, but not as often to an eschatological end.¹⁷⁴ Furthermore, the usage in the DSS is in my opinion quite different from that in the HB regarding this eschatological end. This may point to the fact that Daniel was in fact written at a different time and/or place than the DSS, as one would expect the terminology of material coming from the same time and place to be similar.

2.3.3.3.5 Daniel 9:27

Daniel 9:27, as ambiguous as the three preceding verses, is most important for the present investigation since it is the only verse in this part of the chapter where the word בְּרִית

¹⁷¹ DSSEL translates 1QpHab 7:7 [... פשרו אשר יארוך הקץ האחרון...] 'This means that the Last Days will be long....' The expression קץ אחרון appears in 1QS 4:16-17 and is translated 'last age.' (In context, lines 16b-17a read: 'God has appointed these spirits as equals until the *last age*, and set an everlasting enmity between their divisions'). Lastly, the expression לקץ האחרון is found in 4Q169 (4QpNah) 3-4iv:3 (אשר תשפל מלכותו) 'Its interpretation concerns Manasseh at the *final age* when his kingdom will be brought low ...; DSSEL, italics added).

¹⁷² 4Q398 (4QMMT^c) 14-17ii:4-6: 'Reflect on all these matters and seek from him that he may support your counsel and keep far from you the evil scheming{s} and the counsel of Belial so that *at the end of time*, you may rejoice in finding that some of our words are true' (DSSEL, italics added; הַבְּנֵי כָּל אֱלֹהִים וּבְקִשׁ מִלְּפָנָיו שִׁתְּקֶן 5 אֶת עֲצַתְךָ וְהִרְחִיק מִמֶּךָ (מחשב {ו} ת רעה ועצת בליעל 6 בשל שתשמה באחרית העת במצאך מקצת דברינו כן).

¹⁷³ CD IV:4 and VI:11; 1QpHab IX:6; 1Q28 (1QSa) I:1; 4Q161 (4QpIs-a) 2-6:26; 4Q162 (4QpIs-b) ii:1; 4Q163 (4QpIs-c) 6-7ii:15, 13:4 and 23ii:10; 4Q169 (4QpNah) 3-4ii:2; 4Q174 (4QFlor) 1-2i,21:2 & 12 & 15 & 19, 14:2; 4Q397 (4QMMT-d) IV:13; 4Q398 (4QMMT-e) 11-13:4, 14-17i:6 as well as some smaller fragments.

¹⁷⁴ In the Bible this expression occurs 13 times, always with the preposition ב (cf. Steudel 1993:225), but only once in Daniel (10:14) where it refers to a point in the distant future of Daniel's people long *after* the exile. The context seems to indicate not just the distant future, but an eschatological point in time. Gretler (2004:247) suggests that in this context the expression may be considered a *terminus technicus* for eschatological time. Collins (1997:75) observes that originally the phrase probably meant 'in the course of time, in future days' (as in Gn 49:1 and Nu 24:14) but that later on it took on eschatological connotations. In the prophetic books it 'implies a definitive transformation of Israel in the distant future,' usually with reference to salvation, but in Ezekiel 38 and Daniel 'the concept was broadened to include not only the age of salvation but also the drama that leads up to it' (Collins 1997:75). Willis (1979:69) argues that the phrase should be translated "'in the future" in most, if not all' cases (cf. also Talmon 2003:795), since it is an indefinite term that depends on the context for identifying the immediate or more distant future envisaged. While admitting that some of these occurrences may well refer to the eschatological age or the messiah, he does not consider it a *terminus technicus* for the messianic age (Willis 1979:69).

appears. The verse is devoted to describing the events of the last of the seventy sevens and reads: וְהִגְבִּיר בְּרִית לְרַבִּים שָׁבוּעַ אֶחָד וְחֲצֵי הַשָּׁבוּעַ יִשְׁבִּיתוּ וְזָבַח וּמִנְחָה וְעַל כַּנָּף שְׂקוּצִים מְשֻׁמִּים וְעַד-כָּלָה וְהִגְבִּיר בְּרִית לְרַבִּים שָׁבוּעַ אֶחָד וְחֲצֵי הַשָּׁבוּעַ יִשְׁבִּיתוּ וְזָבַח וּמִנְחָה וְעַל כַּנָּף שְׂקוּצִים מְשֻׁמִּים וְעַד-כָּלָה – And he will establish/strengthen/cause to prevail a covenant for the many [for] one week, but in the middle of the week he will cause to cease sacrifice and (grain) offering, and upon the wing/extremity of abominations [will be] one who desolates, even until complete destruction/[the] end, namely that which is determined, will be poured out upon the one who desolates’ (my translation; but cf. Steinmann 2008:443).

Questions about the meaning of the verse abound: What is meant by בְּרִית? Who is the person who will make that covenant, and who are the many the covenant is being made for? What kind of covenant is in view? What is meant by the last half of the verse, i.e., what is the meaning of the phrases וְעַל כַּנָּף שְׂקוּצִים מְשֻׁמִּים and וְעַד-כָּלָה וְהִגְבִּיר בְּרִית לְרַבִּים?

Daniel 9:27 begins by noting that ‘he will establish/strengthen/cause to prevail a covenant for the many’ (וְהִגְבִּיר בְּרִית לְרַבִּים). The expression הִגְבִּיר for making a covenant is unique in the MT and the DSS. The normal words used for ‘making’ or continuing in a covenant are: כָּרַת (lit. cut; Gn 15:18); קוּם (in the Hiphil, הִקִּים; establish; Gn 9:11); נָתַן (give; Gn 17:1); שָׁם (‘set in place;’ 2 Sm 7:23:5); בּוֹא (Ezk 16:8); even עָבַר (normally ‘transgress,’ but ‘enter’ in Dt 29 and 1QS 1-3). While most of these words refer to God making a covenant with his people, human covenants are also said to be ‘cut’ (Josh 9:6) or ‘entered’ into (בּוֹא; 1 Sm 20:8). The change of terminology in Daniel 9:27 is thus significant. הִגְבִּיר is the Hiphil¹⁷⁵ perfect 3ms consecutive of גָּבַר, which means in the Qal ‘be strong, mighty’ (BDB); ‘excel, accomplish’ (HALOT); or ‘be mighty, prevail’ (CDCH).¹⁷⁶ For the Hiphil BDB suggests for the present verse ‘confirm a covenant,’ HALOT ‘make a firm covenant,’ and CDCH¹⁷⁷ ‘enforce.’ The basic idea of the word has to do with power, strength or superiority and excellence (cf. Kosmala 1977:368; Wakely 1997:806; Kühlewein 1997:299), and this must be reflected somehow when translating the verb (Kosmala 1977:368).¹⁷⁸ In the Qal the word is often used in military contexts where it

¹⁷⁵ The Hiphil of גָּבַר only occurs twice in the MT, here and at Psalm 12:5, but it is quite common in the DSS. It appears that there is not much difference in the translation values of the different stems of this verb.

¹⁷⁶ Oswalt (1999:148) gives the glosses ‘prevail, be mighty, have strength, be great;’ Wakely (1997:806) lists ‘be strong, accomplish, excel, swell, rise, prevail, be superior’ for the verb, adding for the Piel ‘strengthen, make excel, superior,’ for the Hiphil ‘make strong’ and for the Hithpael ‘show oneself mighty or superior to, behave/act with defiant hostility, show oneself insolent, proud.’

¹⁷⁷ CDCH is significant in that it includes references to the DSS as well. This is reflected in the suggested glosses.

¹⁷⁸ In view of this, the German translation ‘er wird den Bund schwer machen’ (i.e. ‘he will make *difficult/hard* the covenant;’ so Luther 1984, Schlachter 1981 and Die Gute Nachricht) is in my opinion not correct. The Elberfelder translation (1987) has ‘er wird *stark* machen’ (i.e. ‘he will make *strong*’) in the substantial text, but in the footnote notes that others translate ‘er wird ... schwer machen.’ Plöger (1965:133) translates ‘<Und es wird *drückend* sein ein Bund für viele> eine Woche (lang)’ and adds in a note that the word בְּרִית seems to be the subject of the sentence, so that he prefers an intransitive form of the verb גָּבַר, hence his translation ‘und schwer [= drückend] wird sein’ (Plöger 1965:135; italics added). Furthermore, Plöger notes that it is not clear whether בְּרִית refers to the covenant

has the connotation of success in war (Wakely 1997:807; cf. Oswalt 1999:148). Quoting Baldwin (1978:171), Wakely (1997:809) suggests that the ‘use of the [Hiphil in Daniel 9:27] implies forcing an agreement by means of superior strength.’

However, Kline (1974:463-464) interprets the connections differently. He believes that the subject of the verb is the messiah of verse 26 (Kline 1974:463, n. 31), not the prince of a nation who is to come (though he thinks this also may refer to the messiah). He believes that the verb הִגְבִּיר in this verse does not refer to the initial covenant making but indicates ‘the powerful and ultimate execution of the sanctions of the covenant, both blessing and curse’ (Kline 1974:464) by using a verb that is even more emphatic than הִקִּים would have been (Kline 1974:465). Kline goes on to note that though the Hiphil of גָּבַר is rare in the MT, it occurs quite frequently in the DSS, especially in the Hodayot where it is often used in contexts where the thought is expressed that through the sufferings and persecutions of the psalmist ‘God demonstrates his power, or prevails’ (Kline 1974:465). However, even in these contexts, בְּרִית is never the object of the verb, as it is in Daniel 9:27.¹⁷⁹ Perhaps closest to the usage in Daniel 9:27 are the two occurrences of גָּבַר in Psalm 103:11 and 117:2 where the psalmist states that God’s covenant faithfulness (חֶסֶד)¹⁸⁰ is great towards or prevails over (גָּבַר) those who fear him, i.e. his people. In both cases, גָּבַר is a Qal perfect 3ms, with God as subject and חֶסֶד as object. In Psalm 103, furthermore, the context speaks of God’s removal of the sins of the people. In Daniel 9, too, the context refers to the forgiveness of Israel’s sin. Kline (1974:465) believes that the usage in these two Psalms is similar to that in Daniel 9:27 where ‘the covenant will be made to prevail answers to the “everlasting righteousness” and to the consummatory aspect in general of the purpose of the seventy weeks as stated in the opening verse (Dan. 9:24).’ Kline (1974:467) goes on to argue that Daniel 9:27 echoes Isaiah 9-10 (the divine title El Gibbor appears there), especially Isaiah 9:5 (Eng 9:6) and 10:21ff. He thinks that the use of הִגְבִּיר in Daniel 9:27 is in fact inspired by the use of the divine title אֱלֹהֵי גִבּוֹר in Isaiah, and that therefore the subject of the verb must be the messiah, not some antichrist figure. This interpretation is not impossible, but I believe the rest of the verse indicates otherwise.

with Yahweh mentioned in Daniel 11:22 and 28, or the ‘*diatheke*’ that the Hellenizers tried to force on the people (cf. 1 Macc 1:11) (Plöger 1965:135). He suggests that both concepts are related in that the ultimate goal of the Hellenizers was the gradual dissolution of the covenant with Yahweh, and therefore he thinks that in the context בְּרִית could possibly refer to both. I do not think this argument is convincing. Firstly, בְּרִית is feminine singular, and so it is unlikely that it is the subject of the masculine singular verb. Secondly, the nuances of גָּבַר do not include the idea of something being ‘difficult, hard.’ Therefore I prefer the substantial *Elberfelder* and most English translations.

¹⁷⁹ Kline (1974:465) points out that 1QH^a 10:26 (for him 1QH^a 2:24) is a covenantal passage where הִגְבִּיר is used. This is correct, but it must be noted that the usage is quite different from Daniel 9:27. In the Hodayot passage, the psalmist states that God manifests his strength through the psalmist (הִגְבִּירָהּ בִּי נֹגַד בְּנֵי אָדָם); in Daniel 9:27, it is the covenant that is the object of the verb.

¹⁸⁰ Kline (1974:465) says this word ‘is a virtual synonym for *b^orit*.’

In addition to the grammatical form of the verb its (indirect) object must also be considered when making a final decision about the best nuance in translation. The covenant is made with or for ‘the many’ (לְרַבִּים).¹⁸¹ The same expression appears in Isaiah 53:11 to designate those who are justified by the Servant though they do not understand why he should suffer,¹⁸² and in Daniel 11:33 and 12:3 to designate a special group of people being taught by the מְשַׁכְּלִים. Is the reference in Daniel 9:27 to this special group, or is another group in view? Are the ‘many’ in Daniel 9:27 the ‘faithful remnant’¹⁸³ or are they collaborators with the forces of evil, either the leaders of the community or the Hellenists in general (presuming a second century date)?

In all these occurrences (i.e. Is 53:11; Dn 9:27; 11:33; 12:3) רַבִּים is as a substantival adjective. In Daniel 12:3 רַבִּים appears with the definite article (in the phrase וּמְצַדִּיקֵי הָרַבִּים; ‘and those who lead the many to righteousness’), but in Daniel 11:33, as in Daniel 9:27 and Isaiah 53:11, there is also a prefixed preposition ל: ‘those who have insight will give understanding *to the many*’ (וּמְשַׁכְּלֵי עַם יְבִינֵוּ לְרַבִּים). In Daniel 11:34 the word ‘many’ without the definite article refers to renegade Jews, but the occurrence in 11:39 is similar to 11:33, i.e. with definite article (and the preposition ב): it is said that the King of the North will cause his supporters ‘to rule *over the many*.’ It seems therefore that the expression הָרַבִּים, ‘*the many*,’ is a reference not to the general multitude that went along with Hellenistic reforms, but to a specialised group who in fact opposed them (cf. van der Kooij 1993:496-497).

In my opinion this also applies in Daniel 9:27 where the translation of the phrase וְהִגְבִּיר בְּרִית לְרַבִּים should be in line with the suggestion that whoever made a covenant with these many imposed (or enforced) it upon them (cf. Baldwin 1978:171; the gloss ‘enforce’¹⁸⁴ suggested in CDCH seems to infer this too): ‘He will impose/enforce a covenant on the many,’ with the implication that ‘the many’ must adhere to its terms. This

¹⁸¹ לְרַבִּים is a masculine plural adjective with definite article and preposition ל, functioning as a substantive, hence ‘*the many*’, rather than simply ‘many.’

¹⁸² According to Fabry, Blum & Ringgren (2004:293) the plural of רַב can occur as a so-called ‘inclusive plural’ with the sense of ‘all,’ i.e. a ‘great multitude’, especially when it occurs in expressions such as עַמִּים רַבִּים or גוֹיִם רַבִּים. They relate the occurrence in Daniel 12:3 to ‘the many’ in Isaiah’s Fourth Servant Song who look uncomprehendingly at the suffering Servant, yet ‘who are nonetheless “justified” by the servant’ (Fabry, Blum & Ringgren 2004:293).

¹⁸³ In the Dead Sea Scrolls, the term הַרְבִּים refers to the ‘general membership’ of the sect (CD XIII:7, DSSSEL; García Martínez 1996:43 has ‘the Many’; Vermes 1998:142 has ‘the Congregation’), as distinct from the leaders who are to instruct them. More than a third of the 180 occurrences of רַב in the DSS have this nuance (sixty-eight; possibly seventy), and all except two of these sixty-eight (or seventy) occurrences are in scrolls related to either CD or IQS. In other words, this specific use of the term is important to these documents, but not in other DSS, sectarian or otherwise.

¹⁸⁴ Kline (1974:465) also notes that that הִגְבִּיר here ‘has in view the enforcing of the terms of a covenant previously granted.’ However, he believes that therefore this ‘can only refer to God’s faithful fulfilment of the covenant He has given to His people.’ While one cannot be dogmatic, I believe that the remainder of the verse seems to indicate otherwise.

indicates that ‘the many’ are probably not renegade Jews who presumably would have gladly accepted such an agreement (especially if it is granted that the first referent of these verses was the time of Antiochus IV). In addition, the word *בְּרִית* then cannot refer to the covenant between God and his people Israel, but must refer to some sort of political agreement (albeit with a religious content; contra Kline 1974:465). It also appears from the context that the person enforcing this covenant is the *נְגִיד הַבָּא* of verse 26 (cf. Baldwin 1978:171). In fact, most scholars agree on this, though the identity of the *נְגִיד הַבָּא* is disputed. These words are the antecedent of *וְהִגְבִּיר*, the only words that are masculine singular and so agree with the verb in gender and number. Such an interpretation keeps the possibility of other referents open and is thus preferable, especially in view of the enigmatic nature of the text.¹⁸⁵

Slotki (1951:79; cf. more recently also Redditt 1999:163) suggests that the word *רַבִּים* means ‘the great ones’ and refers to the ‘chiefs of the people.’¹⁸⁶ However, in view of the similarity of expression to that in Daniel 11 and the DSS¹⁸⁷ where it seems to refer to a particular group of people, I think this is unlikely.

A different proposition is that of Lebram (1984:105) who suggests the translation: ‘*Aber stark wird der Bund der Vielen sich eine Jahrwoche lang zeigen.*’ He argues that the *Bund der Vielen* is probably the cultic community of the people of God (Lebram 1984:105), in fact those among them who were strongly opposed to the occupation and desecration of the temple in Jerusalem (Lebram 1984:110). In view of the fact that the covenant being made seems to concern the sacrificial system this is not unlikely. The question is, however, whether *בְּרִית* here is indeed the subject of the verb *וְהִגְבִּיר* or whether it is not better considered as the object of the sentence. Van der Kooij (1993:497) notes that if the meaning was ‘*der Bund der Vielen,*’ one would expect a Hebrew construction like *הַרְבִּים*, not *לְרַבִּים*. On the other hand, if the expression is

¹⁸⁵ This explanation does not preclude a reference to Antiochus Epiphanes. However, many scholars believe that the verse refers to a covenant he is said to have made with *renegade* Jews (Porteous 1965:143; Lacocque 1979:197-198; Goldingay 1991:262; cf. Towner 1984:144 who refers to 1 Macc 1:54). For the reasons cited above, I think this is less likely. Lucas (2002:245) also agrees with this position, but continues to point out the different interpretations of scholars who consider this section to be a reference to Jesus Christ. He notes that some argue that the verb *וְהִגְבִּיר* does not mean ‘confirm’ or ‘make strong’ but ‘cause to prevail,’ in which case it is considered to be ‘a reference to the ministry of Jesus ending in his death (being ‘cut off’) in the middle of the week’ and that the destruction at the end of the verse refers to that by the Romans in AD 70 (cf. Steinmann 2008:474¹⁸⁵) or to the ‘coming of the Antichrist at some indefinite time in the future’ (Lucas 2002:245). Others consider the ‘death of Jesus as marking the end of the sixty-ninth week’ and suggest that the ‘whole of the last week’ refers ‘to the coming of the Antichrist at some indefinite time in the future’ (Lucas 2002:245). The problem with both views is that it requires the imposition of a gap between the sixty-two weeks and the last week that appears to have no basis in the text.

¹⁸⁶ Slotki (1951:79) has two suggestions as to their identity and the possible historical setting of this covenant: if the text refers to the second century BCE and Antiochus Epiphanes, they are renegade Jews, but if the reference is to the first century CE and Vespasian, the covenant ‘refers to “the seven-years” (*one week*) treaty he made with the Jewish leaders, assuring them of peace, but [which was] broken before half the period had elapsed.’

¹⁸⁷ Where *רַבִּים* is only once translated ‘leaders’, in 1 QpHab IV:2.

considered an Aramaism, Lebram's translation makes sense. However, this is not certain; in addition, in Hebrew בְּרִית is feminine (BDB), and so the verb form does not agree with the gender of the supposed subject. Therefore it seems better to adopt the traditional translation 'He will make strong a covenant for/with the many' (cf. van der Kooij 1993:497), with the proviso that this 'making strong' implies force and that the expression 'the many' refers to faithful Jews.

The covenant is apparently made for a limited time: 'one seven' (שְׁבוּעַ אֶחָד), and the remainder of the verse seems to indicate that it refers particularly to cultic observances ('sacrifices and offerings' are mentioned, and elsewhere in the MT שְׁקוּץ refers to idols or foreign gods¹⁸⁸). This limit is interesting in view of the fact that God's covenant(s) are all unlimited (another point against the notion that it is God who made it).¹⁸⁹ Yet even this limited period is too long for the one who makes the covenant. In the 'middle of the week he will cause sacrifice and offering to cease' (וְהִזְצִי הַשְּׁבִיעִי יִשְׁבִּיתוּ זִבְחָהּ וּמִנְחָהּ).¹⁹⁰ At the beginning of the chapter Daniel prayed to the God who 'keeps covenant and lovingkindness.' This person will not even be bound by his own rules. Not only will the normal cult be abrogated, but 'upon [the] edge/pinnacle [there will be] abominations, one who desolates, until complete destruction, namely that which is determined, will be poured out upon [the] one/thing that desolates' (וְעַל כְּנָר שְׁקוּצִים מְשֻׁמָּם וְעַד-כְּלָהּ וְגַחְחָצָה תִתֵּן עַל-שָׁמַיִם) my translation).¹⁹¹ This is just an attempt to make sense of a very difficult Hebrew clause that has baffled scholars. The meaning seems to be that though for a time there will be horrible abominations instead of true worship of Yahweh at his sanctuary,¹⁹² in the end, these abominations (and those who cause them to be where they should not be) will be utterly

¹⁸⁸ Freedman & Welch (2006:467) correctly observe that in 'Deuteronomy and Kings *šiqqûš* refers specifically to the worship of foreign gods and idols.' The same applies to Jeremiah and Ezekiel (Freedman & Welch 2006:467-468). They believe that in the present context the plural 'may represent a partial dittography' (Freedman & Welch 2006:469), that the expression שְׁקוּצִים מְשֻׁמָּם 'probably contains a play on *ba'al sāmāyim* ... the Phoenician counterpart to Zeus' and that it refers to an image rather than an altar. In their summary they note that the root *šqs* belongs to the lexical field of 'uncleanness' and 'expresses "the strongest revulsion" and abomination on the part of Yahweh toward uncleanness and idolatry' (Freedman & Welch 2006:469). Keel (1998:230), however, makes the interesting observation that in several instances *šiqqûš* refers not to idols, but to prohibited food (Zech 9:7), or to something ritually unclean (Nah 3:6). He thinks that *šiqqûš* here in Daniel 9:27 refers not an idol (least of all Baal-Shamem; Keel 1998:231ff), but to a sacrificial act, namely the sacrifices of pigs offered on the altar, to which the reference in Daniel 8:13 (וְהִכְשַׁע שָׁמַיִם) as well as Josephus (Ant. 12, 253) also point (Keel 1998:230). The ambiguity of the text would seem to allow either option, but in my opinion idolatry seems to be more likely, esp. in view of Daniel's study of Jeremiah (cf. n. 192 below).

¹⁸⁹ Plöger (1965:135) actually suggests that ברית may refer both to the Yahweh covenant and that of the Hellenists who wanted to get rid of it. This view, I think, is unlikely for the reasons stated.

¹⁹⁰ Note that there is no change of subject; therefore it is likely that the same person who makes strong the covenant is also the person who causes the stoppage of the sacrifices.

¹⁹¹ Meyer (2006:243) suggests that if MT is retained, one might translate: 'In the middle of the week, he shall make sacrifice and offering cease; and on the wings of abominations there will be something that brings desolation, until the end and decree of destruction are poured out upon the desolator.' He thinks that the one who brings desolation will put 'an end to the legitimate cult' but in the end he (probably Antiochus Epiphanes) will himself be destroyed. Dommershausen (1995:231) believes that the expression שְׁקוּצִים מְשֻׁמָּם may suggest 'the sudden and unusually terrifying appearance of the destroyer.'

¹⁹² Several times Jeremiah (4:1; 7:30; 13:27; 16:18; 32:34) and Ezekiel (5:11; 7:20; 11:18, 21; 20:7, 8, 30) complain about their countrymen's idol worship, using the term *šiqqûš*.

destroyed. Lust (2001:686) argues convincingly that the participle שָׂמַם has ‘an active and a transitive meaning (just as in Ezk 36:3) and that the last phrase of the verse should be translated ‘[u]ntil the decreed end is poured out over (תַּתֵּךְ עַל) the “appaller” (שָׂמַם).’ The expression ‘pour out over’ (נִתְּךְ עַל) ‘is usually followed by the name of a person or persons upon whom “wrath” or “the end” is poured out’ (Lust 2001:686), rather than an abstract notion such as “desolation” (Lust 2001:686). While I do not favour Lust’s overly specific identification of that person as Antiochus Epiphanes (Lust 2001:687), I think it is a valid suggestion that שָׂמַם may refer to a person in this context.¹⁹³

Plöger (1965:133) translates this part of Daniel 9:27 ‘*und auf Flügel(n) von Greueln (kommt) einer, der verwüstet, bis sich das vorgesehene Ende ergießt auf den, der verwüstet.*’ He notes that the second half of the verse seems to refer to Antiochus Epiphanes, who in December 167 BCE prohibited the Jewish cult and converted the Jerusalem Temple into a sanctuary for the Greek god Zeus (Plöger 1965:142). The end of the seventieth week was set to be the time when this destroyer would himself be destroyed, a time frame vague enough to be considered approximately right for the ultimate death of Antiochus (Plöger 1965:142). Hartman and DiLella (1978:253), in line with an alternative suggested by Plöger,¹⁹⁴ propose that the phrase שְׂקֻצִים מְשֻׂמָּם is an intentional mispronunciation for ‘Baal Shamayim’ (cf. Freedman & Welch 2006:469). All these historical allusions are of course valid in themselves, but the vagueness of the text allows also for other, eschatological interpretations.

2.3.3.4 Summary Remarks on Daniel 9:24-27 and Covenant Terminology in this Section

Daniel 9:24-27 are among the most enigmatic, if not the most enigmatic, verses in the HB. They contain God’s response to Daniel’s prayer of repentance which includes both covenant promises and threats, but more of the latter, and not as explicit as the covenant terminology that prevails in the first part of Daniel 9. Textual difficulties abound in this section, as do interpretations. Verse 24 covers the whole of the ‘seventy sevens’ by noting that during that time period the sin of God’s people (in its manifold aspects) would be

¹⁹³ Goldingay (1991:263) points out the parallel to Daniel 8:13 and notes that in the present verse the phrase הִפְשַׁע שָׂמַם has been replaced by שְׂקֻצִים מְשֻׂמָּם. Goldingay makes the interesting suggestion that שְׂקֻצִים may have been chosen because of its numerical value, 490, or because of the association of both שְׂקֻצִים and שָׂמַם in texts such as Jeremiah 4: 7; 44; and Ezekiel 5: 6 and 7 (Goldingay 1991:263). The plural form שְׂקֻצִים may be in analogy to the Hebrew word אֲלֵהִים (Goldingay 1991:263; cf. Lacocque 1979:199).

¹⁹⁴ Plöger mentions Eissfeldt’s (1963:433) suggestion that אֵל עֶלְיָן might actually refer to אֵל עֶלְיָן, the ‘Lord of Wings’, which may be a title of the Phoenician god of heaven, and which may in turn refer to the Greek god Zeus. If this is so, the following two words, שְׂקֻצִים מְשֻׂמָּם, would be in apposition to this title to make it ‘a Lord of Wings, of Abominations, a Destroyer’ (Plöger 1965:135). Plöger further speculates that this could then imply that אֵל עֶלְיָן may be the subject of תִּשְׁבֵּית, and the whole phrase could then be translated ‘and a Lord of Wings will stop burnt offerings.’ However, he himself prefers to follow MT as he understands it.

dealt with and that ultimately ‘everlasting righteousness’ will be established, together with the ‘sealing up’ (authenticating) of ‘vision and prophet’ and the anointing of a ‘holy of holies,’ which could be either a person or a place. If any of these verses can be interpreted messianically, then this verse would be it. Certainly ‘everlasting righteousness’ is an eschatological ideal never achieved yet in the history of humankind in general and of Israel in particular. Christ died on the cross for the sins of the world, and in this sense he did indeed bring in ‘everlasting righteousness,’ though the final consummation of this fact will only be experienced in the age to come. In this sense one may consider these verses with Brueggemann (1997:267) as ‘promissory.’

Brueggemann (1998:267) defines a ‘promissory text’ as a text which ‘embodies God’s self-commitment’ to his people, which then ‘lingers in the exilic and post-exilic community as an anchor for faith and hope in a context of fickleness and despair.’ He further notes that a promissory text

is not a [mere] prediction, but it is a promise to which Israel clings because of Israel’s confidence in the promise-maker. The promissory text is not “used up” or exhausted in any fulfillment or partial fulfillment, but continues to stand, in situation after situation, in generation after generation, as a witness and testimony to what God intends that has not yet come to fruition (Brueggemann 1998:267).

Though Brueggemann (1998:267) writes this regarding Jeremiah 30-33, I believe it applies to Daniel 9:24-27 (and indeed to 11:35-12:13) as well. Wright (2014:304) takes Brueggemann’s statement further by arguing that a promissory text must therefore be interpreted ‘on three horizons,’ i.e. ‘the same text may find fulfilment at different points ... along the great biblical story.’ These are 1. ‘the horizon of the prophet’s own world,’ i.e. ‘the OT era itself;’ 2. ‘the horizon of the New Testament,’ i.e. the interpretation of the text in relation to Jesus Christ; and 3. ‘the eschatological horizon of the return of Christ and the new creation’ (Wright 2014:304). In this case, the first application of Daniel 9:24-27 may well have been to the situation under Antiochus Epiphanes, but Christians were also justified in applying the verses to Christ as well as to present and future times of difficulty and indeed the time of tribulation predicted for the end of the age. Certainly Daniel 9:24-27 is enigmatic and ambiguous enough to allow for such different applications.

Daniel 9:25-27 discuss the events of the ‘seventy sevens’ in more detail, and in three divisions: seven sevens, sixty-two sevens, and one seven. The first seven sevens are dealt with cursorily, almost as an aside. A ‘word’ (or ‘command’) would go out ‘to return and rebuild Jerusalem,’ and from the time that happened to the coming of an enigmatic ‘anointed one, a leader/prince’ there will be ‘seven sevens’ or ‘seven sevens and sixty-two sevens’ (depending on the translation; early Christian interpretation has usually adopted the second view). It was noted that this ‘anointed one’ could be either a royal or a priestly

figure, and that a messianic interpretation is not impossible. The ‘sixty-two sevens’ too do not receive much attention beyond the fact that it is noted that these are ‘troubled times’ during which Jerusalem would be rebuilt.

The focus of the prophecy is on what happens *after* these seven sevens and sixty-two sevens (vv. 26-27). The first thing is that ‘an anointed one will be cut off and will have nothing.’ It was noted that this person is often considered to be one of the High Priests (Onias III), though a messianic interpretation cannot be ruled out completely, in which case it would refer to Christ. Then the rebuilt city and sanctuary will be destroyed by ‘the people of the prince to come.’ Then ‘his [the prince’s] or its [the city and sanctuary’s] end will come with a flood’ and until the very end there will be war and terrible destruction (v. 26). Verse 27 refers specifically to the last seven, more precisely to the second half of the last seven. Someone, most likely the ‘prince to come’ (since he is the immediate antecedent of the first verb in v. 27), though possibly the ‘anointed one’ (less likely, since he is a more remote antecedent of the first verb in v. 27), will ‘cause to be strong/impose/enforce a covenant’ on a group called ‘the many’ (most likely faithful Jews), apparently referring to cultic procedures. However, the rest of the verse then notes that this covenant will not be adhered to for long, since ‘in the middle of the [last] seven’ this person will abolish ‘sacrifice and offering.’ Instead, some horrible abomination will be set up, but ultimately the person causing these abominations will himself be destroyed. The whole tenor of verse 27 is negative, hence it is less likely that there is a messianic reference here. Therefore I believe that initially the covenant here is not one of the covenants God made with his people, but a political one, albeit referring to religious practices (though some, e.g. Steinmann 2008:474, think it refers to the new covenant Christ instituted; cf. also Kline 1974).

As already noted, the ambiguous nature and the vast variety of possible interpretations of this text indicates that more than one application is possible. Perhaps the first reference was indeed to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, though of course the complete destruction of Jerusalem at that time is one of the predictions that remained unfulfilled. It was certainly applied to Christ by the early church, and this interpretation has a long history, though the details of a messianic interpretation are again debatable. Jesus himself referred to Daniel 9:27 when he warned his disciples about events relating to the fall of Jerusalem to the Romans (Mt 24:15; Mk 13:14), though these events themselves were merely foreshadowing more sinister eschatological times. This paves the way for those interpretations that consider this prophecy to apply to the future antichrist.

2.4 Explanatory Notes on Daniel 10-12 with Particular Reference to Covenant Terminology

2.4.1 Introduction to Daniel 10-12

Daniel 10-12 comprise the last and most comprehensive of the vision reports in the book. Chapter 10 introduces the vision by giving a detailed account of its setting. The main vision (or perhaps rather audition, cf. Goldingay 1991:282, since the angel explains what will happen to Daniel and it is not clear if Daniel also sees what is being explained) is reported from chapter 11:1-12:4, though the angel actually begins speaking in 10:20. However, 10:20-21 are introductory to the main speech which outlines the history of the remainder of the Persian empire briefly and that of the Greek empire which will succeed it in greater detail than the previous visions in chapters 7-9. Chapter 12:5-13 is usually considered an epilogue, though Meadowcroft (2004b:106) argues that rather than being an epilogue (and chapter 10 a prologue), Daniel 12:5-13 and Daniel 10 form ‘the framework within which ch. 11 may be understood.’ Goldingay (1991:289) rightly observes that these chapters ‘are given special emphasis by their length and their location at the end of the book.’¹⁹⁵ In Wildgruber’s opinion, Daniel 10-12 provide in fact the key to understanding the whole book, as indicated by the title of her study: *Daniel 10-12 als Schlüssel zum Buch* (Wildgruber 2013).

I shall briefly discuss chapter 10:1-11:19, then focus on 11:20-45, with particular attention to those sections where the word *בְּרִיַּת* occurs, and conclude with a brief overview of chapter 12. Before doing this, however, it is important to draw the connection of this vision to Daniel 9.¹⁹⁶ Daniel had been praying and confessing his people’s sins since he presumed from his understanding of Jeremiah’s prophecy of the 70 years that the deliverance of the Jews from exile was drawing near (9:2). Daniel 9 is set at the very beginning of the Persian rule, before Cyrus’ decree that allowed the Jews (and other captive nations) to return to their homeland, provided they promised to pray for him. In Daniel’s prayer he not only confessed his sin, but also pleaded with God to fulfil his promise through Jeremiah. As an answer to his prayer, the angel Gabriel explained to him that far from being over, the problems of the Jewish people were not going to stop with the end of the seventy year exile, but would go on for seventy weeks of years, i.e. 490 years, probably a symbolic figure indicating an indefinite length of time, a time that would be

¹⁹⁵ This includes the lengthy introduction to the vision, which contrasts significantly with the brevity of the introductions to the visions in chapters 7 and 8. Goldingay (1991:289) also notes that links between these chapters and the previous visions ‘are pointed up by links of vocabulary’ (such as *בְּרִיַּת*, *הַמְדוּרֹת*).

¹⁹⁶ Block (2006:49) rightly observes that the ‘numerous links with 9:24-27 suggest that chapter 11 functions as a kind of resumptive exposition of the earlier text, with Daniel’s attention being fixed on the historical events that will surround the coming of the Messiah.’

fraught with opposition and war. We are not told how Daniel reacted to this revelation, but it is likely that he continued pondering it and perhaps it was in reaction to his uncertainty about it, compounded by news of the returned exiles, that he embarked on his fast (10:2).

2.4.2 The Setting of the Vision/Audition (Daniel 10:1-19)

Chapter 10 introduces Daniel, now an old man of about 85 years of age (Miller 1994:276), still in Persia, though probably no longer in the king's service (cf. Dn 1:21),¹⁹⁷ who has been 'mourning for three weeks' (Dn 10:2). He identifies himself both by his Jewish name, Daniel, and by his Babylonian name, Belteshazzar, perhaps to ensure that his readers will recognize him as the same person who had previously served at the courts of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar and Darius the Mede respectively (Miller 1994:276; see also Albani 2010:238).¹⁹⁸

The historical background of the vision in Daniel 10-12, apart from the note that this is Cyrus' third year on the throne, i.e. about 536/535 BCE (Longman 1999:246), is lacking. This is the only vision set in the reign of Cyrus.¹⁹⁹ Presumably Daniel has seen the first of the exiles return to Judah (since Cyrus' decree to this effect went out two years earlier, cf. Ezra 1:2-4; 2 Chr 36:23), though this is not explicitly stated.²⁰⁰ Ezra 3 tells us how the about 50000 returned exiles began to rebuild first the altar of burnt sacrifice and then the temple, but Ezra 4:4-5 goes on to explain that the rebuilding of the temple building was thwarted by 'the people of the land' who 'discouraged the people of Judah and made them afraid to build and bribed counselors against them to frustrate their purpose, all the days of Cyrus king of Persia, even until the reign of Darius king of Persia' (NASB). It is possible that a report of the difficulties the people faced had reached Daniel which caused him to engage in a lengthy time of fasting and prayer for his people, trying to understand the situation (cf. Shea 1983:233).

¹⁹⁷ The OG reads 'first year' here, but Collins (1993:372) notes that this 'has been taken as a harmonization with' Daniel 1:21 (cf. Hartmann & DiLella 1978:262), though he also remarks that the 'alteration ... may be accidental' (Collins 1993:372).

¹⁹⁸ Longman (1999:246) suggests that he may have wanted to remind his readers that 'even at the end of his life [he was] still in exile.'

¹⁹⁹ Unless one assumes that Darius the Mede is to be identified with Cyrus (as do e.g. Colless 1992; Wiseman 1965:12-14), in which case chapters 8-9 are also set in Cyrus' reign. An interesting suggestion is made by Hartman & DiLella (1978:277) who note that the 'fictitious date' of 'the "third year of Cyrus," or 536 B.C., was deliberately written here so that the years of Daniel's ministry, which began in 606 ... would total the biblically perfect number seventy. If this suggestion be correct, then it could also be said that Daniel's "perfect" (i.e. most significant and extensive) vision took place in the seventieth or "perfect" year of his ministry.' As noted in the introduction to this chapter, I do not believe that the date references in Daniel are fictitious, but the suggestion is nonetheless intriguing, since it would imply another oblique reference to the perfect number seven/seventy.

²⁰⁰ Collins (1993:372) observes that here as elsewhere in Daniel the return of the exiles is being ignored. This may be a point in favour of a second century dating when the exile was no longer a matter of urgent concern to either the writer or audience. On the other hand, one may argue that this is a deliberate omission on the part of the writer, who may have assumed it was common knowledge among his audience.

Daniel's vision takes place on the 'twenty-fourth day of the first month' by the river Tigris, after living for three weeks on the most basic of foods and denying himself all luxury (10:3; cf. Howe 2008:446). If a second century dating is accepted, Daniel would probably have fasted because, as Lucas (2002:275) notes, 'Antiochus Epiphanes [had] "turned [the feast of Passover and Unleavened Bread] into mourning" by' proscribing them. In any case, the timing of the vision is significant, as Passover celebrates the exodus of Israel from slavery in Egypt, but instead of celebrating, Daniel was mourning. Albani (2010:239) correctly argues that this may indicate Daniel's desire for the deliverance of the Jews from Babylonian exile.²⁰¹ In addition, Seow (2003:154) remarks, if the seventy years of Jeremiah were to be taken literally, his predictions as well as those of Isaiah 40-55 'should have been fulfilled, for Jerusalem has indeed paid her dues and "her conflict" has ended.' But Daniel finds that this is not the case, hence his fasting and prayer, and probably further reflection on the explanation he had received earlier (9:24-27).

The description of the vision of the heavenly being (Dn. 10:5-6) is reminiscent of the appearance of Christ to John in Revelation 1 (cf. Hartmann & DiLella 1978:280; Hammer 1976:102). This has naturally led a number of scholars to assume that in the present text we have a revelation of the pre-incarnate Christ (e.g. Steinmann 2008:479;²⁰² Young 1949:225).²⁰³ In favour of such an identification is the description of the figure, which is radically different from the heavenly interpreters and the angel Gabriel in chapters 7 to 9, since in those chapters there is in fact no clear description of the persons who explain the visions to Daniel. In contrast to the rather down-to-earth descriptions of the persons explaining his visions or thoughts to Daniel in chapters 7 to 9,²⁰⁴ the vision in

²⁰¹ We are not told why Daniel 'had ... not been repatriated to Palestine' (Seow 2003:153). Perhaps it was due to his age; perhaps he served longer in the Persian government and was unable to go (notwithstanding the note in Dn 1:21; cf. Miller 1994:277); or perhaps he felt he should remain as a spiritual guide to those of the exiles who had remained in Babylon. Whatever the reason, and despite the Persian's more liberal outlook towards exiled people, he obviously still felt the burden of the exile intensely. Though the people were free to go back to their homeland, they were not really free in that they were still under the dominion of a foreign power, and as a new element in a now more or less hostile environment they faced opposition all around (cf. Ezr 4:4-5).

²⁰² Steinmann (2008:482) suggests that this vision, according to the date given it in this chapter, places it 'just a few weeks before work began to rebuild the foundation of the temple in Jerusalem (Ezra 3:8)' and opines that the warfare described in 10:20-11:1 'most probably concerned efforts by Christ and his angels to defend the work on the temple from evil spirits, who naturally would oppose the reestablishment of God's dwelling place on earth as the site of sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins and the salvation of all who believe.' Steinmann of course believes that the heavenly figure here is the pre-incarnate Christ, a view that is debatable, as the discussion below shows. It is also anachronistic to speak of 'Christ' in the OT era – one should at least qualify it by noting that it was the *pre-incarnate* Christ that is in view.

²⁰³ So apparently also Hartmann & DiLella (1978:279-280), though their opinion is not quite clear. They suggest that the identification of the figure as Gabriel 'is far from certain' and quote Charles (2006:257) who notes that Daniel's reaction to this figure is far more intense than to Gabriel in previous chapters. Charles (2006:257) argues that one should read instead of אִישׁ אֶחָד, 'a man,' 'one like a son of man' כְּאִישׁ אֶחָד, i.e. a theophany. So also Buchanan (1999:303), who remarks that the description is to convince the reader 'that this was a divine being.'

²⁰⁴ Daniel 7:16 tells us how Daniel, anxious about what he had dreamt, 'approached one of those who stood there and asked him the truth concerning all this' (ESV). It is not even clear who that person is, but Daniel does not seem to be afraid of him. In 8:15 we are told how Daniel, wondering about the meaning of the preceding vision, saw standing before him 'one having the appearance of a man' (ESV). This seems to refer to the angel Gabriel, who then receives

chapter 10 is quite awe-inspiring. Though still in form looking like a human being, the description of this man's body as 'like beryl' (וּגְוַיִּתּוֹ כְּתַרְשִׁישׁ), his face as 'the appearance of lightning' (וּפְנָיו כְּמֵרָאָה בְּרָק), his eyes as 'flaming torches' (וְעֵינָיו כְּלַפְיֵדֵי אֵשׁ), his limbs as 'the gleam of burnished bronze' (וּזְרָעָתָיו וּמַרְגְּלָתָיו כְּעֵין נְחֹשֶׁת קֶלֶל) and his voice as that of 'the sound of a multitude' (וְקוֹל דְּבָרָיו כְּקוֹל הַמָּוֶן) is supernatural indeed. The 'gleam of burnished bronze' (כְּעֵין נְחֹשֶׁת קֶלֶל) appears also in Ezekiel 1:7 in the description of the four living creature's legs, but otherwise those beings are described quite differently. Albani (2010:240) suggests that the description here is that of a heavenly priest, and that the purpose is to highlight the 'nature of light' (*Lichtnatur*) of the heavenly being appearing to Daniel. All this, including Daniel's reaction to the vision which is much stronger than in the previous chapters, indicates that this might indeed be a manifestation of the preincarnate Jesus.²⁰⁵

Against such an identification, however, is the explanation by this person that he has been delayed because he had to overcome the opposition of the 'prince of Greece' with the help of Michael, 'one of the chief princes' (Dn 10:13). The book of Daniel continuously emphasizes God's complete control over events that take place on earth, as 'commander-in-chief' so to speak, and therefore it is more likely that this figure is an angel, perhaps even Gabriel himself (cf. Porteous 1965:152; Reditt 1999:169-171), though this identification is not made explicit (cf. Collins 1993:373; Albani 2010:241). In addition, the heavenly figure says that no-one helped him (lit. showed himself strong, the Hithpael participle of הִזָּק) against the prince of Greece except *your* prince Michael (interestingly the suffix is 2mp, שְׂרָרְכֶם; referring to the nation of Israel or perhaps more narrowly Daniel and his companions, though they are hiding); it is more likely that if the heavenly figure was indeed a manifestation of God himself that he would have said '*my* people.' Furthermore, if it is accepted that Ezekiel's vision influenced this description, it must be noted that the beings Ezekiel saw were not divine figures, but angelic beings

from a man's voice the instruction to go and help Daniel understand what he has seen (Dn 8:16). This time, Daniel is frightened and apparently faints (Dn 8:17-18), but after having been touched by the angel is able to receive the instruction given (8:19ff). No description is given of the angel or the person who instructs him to talk to Daniel, apart from saying that he looked like a human being. Daniel 9:20-21 simply reports that Gabriel, whom Daniel had seen in a previous vision, came 'in swift flight' and gave him the message of the seventy year-weeks. Nothing is said about Daniel's feelings or Gabriel's appearance.

²⁰⁵ Wildgruber (2013:272) observes that it is no longer possible to ascertain in how far real visionary experiences lie behind the report of Daniel 10, but that the setting as a visionary revelation gives Daniel 10-12 'eine besondere Autorität.' Moreover, she notes, through the vision heaven and earth, the divine and human sphere, are combined (Wildgruber 2013:272). On the verbal plane, the significance of the vision becomes clear through the use of the words אמת ('truth', Dn 10:21; 11:2) and גלה ('reveal', Dn 10:1; Wildgruber 2013:272-273). Though Wildgruber is of course correct that today we can no longer prove that the visions that are reported in Daniel actually happened, I believe that the reference to 'truth' does indeed imply such a claim (cf. Howe 2008:445). Moreover, despite the fact that 'visions' are individual, supernatural experiences which others cannot prove or disprove, I think that in the Bible, which is God's word to believers, such visions are reported precisely in order to pass on divine truths.

appearing in their full glory and splendour, carrying, as it were, the throne of God as they came closer.²⁰⁶ By implication, the same may also be assumed here.

Verse 7 makes it clear that Daniel was not alone when he had the initial vision, but though his companions did not themselves see anything, the atmosphere was so charged with the supernatural that they disappeared in terror in order to hide, leaving Daniel alone to face whatever was going to happen (Dn 10:7). Daniel for his part feels that all energy has left him (Dn 10:8), and when he hears the voice of the angel he falls ‘into a deep sleep’ (Dn 10:9; the word for ‘deep sleep’ is the same as that used in Jonah 1:5, רדם). The heavenly visitor, however, helps him up again (Dn 10:10) and addresses him in words similar to Daniel 9:23: ‘O Daniel, *man of high esteem*, understand the words that I am about to tell you’ (Dn 10:11, NASB, italics added; Hebrew דְּנִיָּאל אִישׁ־הַמְּדוּת הַגָּבוֹר בְּדַבְרֵי־אֱשֶׁר־אֶגִּיד לְךָ).²⁰⁷

Hearing this, Daniel takes heart and stands up, though he is still trembling with fear (Dn 10:11). The angelic being further encourages Daniel by telling him not to be afraid because God heard his prayer from the time he first started to pray and humble himself before God, but it had taken a while, in fact twenty-one days, to get the answer to Daniel because of a conflict in the ‘heavenly places’ (cf. Eph 6:12) which had prevented the angel to bring the answer to Daniel immediately (Dn 10:12). This conflict took place between the speaker who was aided by ‘Michael, one of the chief princes,’ and the prince of Persia, and later in 10:20 where the conflict is said to continue, also the prince of Greece. In other words, it involved exactly the same realms that were going to be the subject of the following explanation (Albani 2010:241).

In the previous three visions, the person who explains the vision to Daniel is variously described as ‘one of those standing’ (Dn 7:16; חָדָל מִן־הַקְּאֻמָּיָא), ‘one looking like a man’ (Dn 8:15; כְּמַרְאֵה־גִּבּוֹר) and ‘the man Gabriel’ (9:21; הָאִישׁ גַּבְרִיאֵל). Only in this last vision is the heavenly interpreter labelled a ‘prince’ or ‘angel,’ שָׂר,²⁰⁸ and Michael is even termed a ‘chief prince’ (10:13; אֶתְחַד הַשָּׂרִים הָרְאשֹׁנִים).²⁰⁹

²⁰⁶ Bampfylde (1983:130) suggests that this figure here is neither Michael nor Gabriel, but an angelic being of a higher order than even Michael. She suggests he is ‘to be identified with “the Prince of the host”’ in Daniel 8:11, ‘one of the highest angels, – a “Prince” and a heavenly military commander’ who also exercises priestly functions (Bampfylde 1983:130).

²⁰⁷ Daniel 9:23 reads: וָאֲנִי בָאתִי לְהַגִּיד לְךָ כִּי חֲמוּדוֹת אֶתָּה וּבִין בְּדַבְרֵי וְהָבֵן בְּמַרְאֵה, ‘But I have come to tell you for *you are treasured* (by God); therefore understand the word and pay attention to the vision’ (my translation).’

²⁰⁸ Whether or not the ‘princes’ of Persia and Greece are earthly or supernatural figures has been debated. Davies (1985:63) observes that in ‘Jewish literature of this period, the Hebrew *sār* [sic] replaces *mal’āk* [‘messenger’] as the more usual word for ‘angel.’ He adds that the connotation is that of a ‘military commander’ and that it implies ‘as a rule a commander of a heavenly army [‘host’]’ (Davies 1985:63; cf. also HALOT on שָׂר, definitions 6-7). Shea (1983:235) argues that the ‘Prince of Persia’ here was not an angelic being, but referred to Cambyses, the Persian

The heavenly interpreter assures Daniel that he has come to him to ‘give [him] understanding about what will befall [his] people at the end of days, for the vision is about [future] days yet to come’ (10:14, my translation; וְבִאֲתֵי לְהַבְיִינָה אֶת אֲשֶׁר־יִקְרֶה לְעַמּוּךָ בְּאַחֲרֵי יָמִים). If, as suggested above, Daniel had been pondering the vision he saw a few years earlier (cf. 9:24-27) and was wondering what was happening to the Jews, especially those who had returned to Judah and there faced difficulties and opposition, he is going to receive an answer, even though it probably was not what he wanted to hear. In all the vision explanations in the Hebrew chapters the giving of understanding (בִּינָה; לְהַבְיִינָה; e.g. 9:22), Daniel’s desire to gain understanding, and the call to Daniel to understand (הַבֵּן, e.g. 8:17), but also his concern that despite the explanation he did not understand (אֵין מֵבִין, 8:27; לֹא אָבִין, 12:8), are important ingredients. It is clear that such understanding can only come from God (in these chapters through his mediating angels), but also that there must be a desire on the part of the human being to gain understanding and insight in order to receive it. The mystery of the revelations Daniel received is in the fact that they pertained to events ‘in the latter days’ or ‘for days to come’ (10:14), and the symbolism used does not exactly contribute to clarify the meaning of these terms.

The expression בְּאַחֲרֵי יָמִים, commonly translated ‘in the latter days,’ is ‘clearly eschatological’ (Hartman & Di Lella 1978:284).²¹⁰ Here in Daniel 10:14, the immediate reference point appears to be the crisis under Antiochus Epiphanes which is described in great detail in chapter 11 (cf. Hartman & Di Lella 1978:284), but the deliberate vagueness

crown prince who would later succeed Cyrus on the throne, but in view of the context this seems less likely. Stevens (2000:416) rightly counters that the term שָׂר is never applied to a crown prince or a king in biblical Hebrew, and in addition this meaning could certainly not apply to the ‘Prince of Greece’ in Daniel 10:20. He argues that the term ‘refers to a demon, not a “human ruler”’ in Daniel 10:13 (Stevens 2000:418), and furthermore suggests that the princes of Persia and Greece are ‘demonic princes established over their respective *nations*’ (Stevens 2000:418), not geographical territories (Stevens 2000:427). Collins (1974a:56) surmises, on the analogy of Revelation 12:7-8, that both Michael and the ‘Prince of Greece’ may have been accompanied by their heavenly host rather than simply involved in single combat, but this is of course pure conjecture.

Meadowcroft (2004b:109) proposes that the ambiguous nature of the word שָׂר indicates that one should perhaps not make too much of a distinction between earthly and supernatural beings in this case. He writes: ‘In this context, it is entirely reasonable to envisage that Michael and his colleague encounter in some material way the current temporal rulers of Greece and Persia, without excluding the possibility that there is a heavenly significance to the encounter. The presence of the princes of Persia and Greece in the story therefore constitutes an important indicator of the apocalyptic vision of earth and heaven (and spirit and matter) and the interaction between the two contained in the book of Daniel’ (Meadowcroft 2004b:109-110).

²⁰⁹ The idea that there are angel-princes of nations is rooted in Israelite history and goes back to Deuteronomy 32:8-9. Albani (2010:242) suggests that the angels of the nations were the old gods of these people, since the description resembles the Babylonian and Canaanite worldviews which considered that what happens on earth is merely a mirror image of what happens in heaven (Babylon), and that the sons of the high god El were allocated to the nations of the world (Canaan; Albani 2010:241). Whether or not this is indeed the background in Daniel 10, this pagan background has been thoroughly adapted to the biblical world view. Though it appears from Daniel 10:13 that ‘events on earth (especially battles) are influenced by heavenly involvement’ (Lucas 2002:275-276), elsewhere in the OT it is always made clear that ultimately God fights for and is victorious on behalf of his people (cf. Nu 10:35-36; Dt 33:2-3; Jdg 5:19-20; Hb 3:12-13)’ (Lucas 2002:276). Lucas (2002:276) suggests that in Daniel 10 the opposition might be considered a real war in heaven, whatever this means (see also Meadowcroft 2004b:109-110), and that ‘presumably the idea implied is that “the prince of Persia” tried to prevent the declaration of the message, because the declaration of God’s intention means its implementation’ (cf. Goldingay (1991:292).

²¹⁰ The expression בְּאַחֲרֵי יָמִים, is discussed in more detail above in note 174.

of the text allows for an eschatological interpretation/application as well. Seow (2003:161) and others rightly observe a verbal similarity with Habakkuk 2:3.

Daniel's reaction to this revelation is that he becomes quite literally speechless, apparently through awe, since the human-like figure comes and touches his lips to enable him to speak again (10:15; cf. Albani 2010:243-244). This is reminiscent of the initiations of Isaiah (Is 6:7, though in Daniel's case less painful) and Jeremiah (Jr 1:9),²¹¹ though the difference here is that it appears late in Daniel's life rather than at the beginning of his ministry as is the case with Isaiah and Jeremiah.

It is interesting to see how Daniel now stresses the human appearance of the angel, no longer his glory. Apparently it was this, as well as the touch and kind words of the angel that encouraged Daniel to the point that he was able to communicate with him. Nonetheless, the respectful words that Daniel uses and the fact that he feels completely devoid of strength and energy shows his continuing awe in the presence of the heavenly figure (10:16-17). The angel again reaches out to Daniel and touches him, thus restoring his strength, and accompanying his touch with the words, 'O man greatly loved, fear not, peace be with you; be strong and of good courage' (10:19, ESV; אֶל־תִּירָא אִישׁ־חַמְדוֹת שְׁלוֹם לְךָ. ²¹² At this, Daniel is now strong enough and ready to hear the message the angel has come to bring (Dn 10:19).

2.4.3 The Angel's Message to Daniel (Daniel 10:20-12:4)

Daniel 10:20-12:4 comprises the long speech of the angel to Daniel in which he outlines the immediate and more distant future to come for the Jews. After a brief introduction, the angel launches into his account of the historical events that can be expected to occur over the next few centuries, apparently with an emphasis on the Greek empire under the Seleucids and Ptolemies, and especially on the devastating results of Antiochus IV Epiphanes' reign. However, the events in this section are described with sufficient vagueness to allow the supposition that this overlaps with a reign even more terrifying than Antiochus': that of an eschatological figure often identified with the 'antichrist' (see below).

²¹¹ Albani (2010:244) suggests that this indicates a connection to absolution, but even more so to the continuity with prophecy. Seow (2003:161) rightly notes that this similarity to 'the [prophetic] call narratives effectively suggests that the prophets do not speak on their own account; they speak only because they have been divinely enabled.'

²¹² The words אִישׁ־חַמְדוֹת שְׁלוֹם לְךָ probably mean something like 'you are safe,' i.e. they are a statement of fact meant to assure Daniel that there is no need to fear for his life (Hartman & Di Lella 1978:265; cf. Collins 1993:375).

One interesting grammatical feature of this speech is the fact that the story line in these verses is carried by ו-conjunction plus imperfect or ו-consecutive plus perfect forms. The ו-consecutive imperfect never occurs in the reported speech of the angel, though it does appear in Daniel 10 and 12 in the narrative sections reporting what Daniel sees or the angel speaks. Lexically there is the repetition of a number of terms, such as מָצַח and קָיָה. The word מָצַח is used in the sense of ‘rise to power’ or ‘rise against another king’ or ‘ruling with power’ (Baldwin 1978:189; 11:3, 4, 7, 14, 20, 21), but also (when negated) in the sense of ‘not being able to sustain that power’ or ‘retaining support’ (11:6, 15, 17, 25). The term קָיָה is used in different stems to indicate either ‘becoming strong’ or ‘strengthening oneself or others,’ as well as ‘seizing power or territory’ (11:5, 6, 7, 21, 32). Baldwin (1978:189) astutely notes that ‘despite the fact that rulers become strong, suddenly they stand no longer; their kingdoms are broken, they retreat, they fall. This pattern recurs in the ... chapter and emphasizes the fleeting glory achieved by conquest.’

2.4.3.1 Introduction to the Message (10:20-11:1)

The angel begins his message with a rhetorical question (10:20; cf. Collins 1993:376): ‘Do you know why I have come to you?’ Then he explains that immediately after giving his message to Daniel, he will have to go back to fight ‘against the prince of Persia’ as well as ‘the prince of Greece’ who will come once the battle with the ‘prince of Persia’ is over (10:20; cf. Collins 1993:376). This introduction serves as kind of a summary of the details that follow (cf. Longman 1999:252). Daniel must realize that what happens on earth has its source in the heavenly conflict in which the angel is involved. It is also made clear that the Persian empire, though still at its beginning, would not last and would before long be superseded by the Greek empire.

Collins (1993:376) observes that ‘[d]espite the urgency of the battle, the angel waits to inform Daniel before he goes.’ In fact, what the angel tells Daniel is nothing new (at least not with God), but it is ‘inscribed in a writing of truth’ (הַרְשׁוּם בְּכַתָּב אֱמֻנָה). Goldingay (1991:272) translates perhaps more accurately ‘inscribed in a reliable book’ (cf. also Anderson 1984:128).²¹³ Longman (1999:252) observes that within the context of the story the reader ‘is invited to share, this is nothing short of gloriously good news,’ since

²¹³ Collins (1993:276) observes that the concept of such a heavenly book goes back ‘to the Babylonian tablets of destiny’ and implies ‘strong deterministic overtones.’ However, elsewhere in the Bible the idea of a heavenly book appears as well (cf. Ps 139:16; Mal 3:16; Rev 5:1). In extra-biblical literature the concept occurs, for example, in 1 Enoch 81 and 93 (Goldingay 1991:293). Anderson (1984:128) suggests that one should not take the reference to a real book too literally. He believes that it simply implies ‘a record of what is about to happen. It is the purpose of the author to suggest that what will occur in the future, up to and including the time of the end, is so firmly fixed that it has already received written form. History will proceed according to this script.’

the Jews were still a persecuted minority. Hence the ‘fact that God has scripted history and that the rescue of his people is the punch line is cause for great optimism and celebration’ (Longman 1999:253).

The angel then tells Daniel that he (the angel) will have to fight the opposing angel princes alone, except for the help of Michael (10:21). Miller (1994:289) insightfully suggests that this was ‘not because no one was available but because no one else was needed.’ Daniel 11:1²¹⁴ continues this thought by stating that the speaker had already arisen three years before when Darius the Mede²¹⁵ came into power ‘to be an encouragement and a protection to him’ (11:1, NASB). It is not quite clear whether ‘him’ refers to Darius²¹⁶ or to Michael, but given the situation of war between the angel of Persia and the speaker, it is more likely to be the latter (so most commentators, e.g. Young 1949:231; Goldingay 1991:293; Longman 1999:253).

2.4.3.2 The End of the Persian Empire Is Near (11:2)

Before finally launching into the account of the future history of the ancient Near East as it would affect the Jews, the angel once more emphasises that he is speaking the truth, i.e. verifiable events are being related (11:2a).²¹⁷ Miller (1994:291) opines that this reference to the truth ‘probably implies a connection with the earlier “Book of Truth” (10:21).’

²¹⁴ Some scholars, e.g. Hartman & Di Lella (1978), consider Daniel 11:1 a ‘later interpolation’ (Hartman & Di Lella 1978:266) or simply consider it supplementary information not part of the main text (as NIV, which brackets all of 10:21b-11:1). David (1993:512), however, rightly argues that Daniel 11:1 is part of ‘the framing of the historical revelation (11,2b-45).’ He shows that this is arranged in a chiasmic structure, and therefore the verse should be included in the main text rather than considered as a gloss.

²¹⁵ On the historicity or otherwise of Darius see the introduction to this chapter. According to the internal testimony of the book, the first year of Darius must have been about 535 BCE, soon after the capture of Babylon by Persia. The present chapter is set about three years later. Since the date reference in Daniel 1:1 is to 605 BCE, the reference to Darius implies exactly seventy years have passed from the deportation of Jehoiakim to the fall of the Babylonian empire. See also above note 199.

²¹⁶ Hengstenberg (1865:304) interpreted it this way: ‘But it would be much more correct to render it thus: “and I (under the auspices of Michael your prince) also stood in the first year of the Mede, that I might assist and strengthen him, Darius.”’ See also Seow (2003:168).

²¹⁷ Wildberger (1997:152) notes that speaking אמת ‘refers not to the speaker’s dependability but to the pronouncement’s dependability.’ Later on, Wildberger (1997:156) comments that in Daniel the word is used in the sense of ‘a secret revelation, a deep, not directly accessible knowledge,’ similar to Ps 51:8. He continues: ‘Dan. 8:26, “the vision that has been revealed is *’emet*,” can only mean that the vision is true because one can depend upon it, certain that the fulfillment will not fail, just as in 10:1 and 11:2. ... These Dan passages are sharply distinguished from 1 Kgs 17:24. The latter maintains that Yahweh has really (in truth) spoken to the prophets; the former maintains that he has communicated the truth to the apocalypticist—indeed, in such a way that this revelation is a mirror image of the coming events. These events are recorded in the book of *’emet* (Dan. 10:21), the “book of truth”.’ In Daniel 8:12, then, the word refers to ‘the truth of Judaism’ (Wildberger 1997:156). Wildberger (1997:156) concludes that thus ‘Dan initiates a new understanding of *’emet*, and thereby a new understanding of truth itself.’ Wildgruber (2013:263) observes a connection between the range of meaning of אמת and that of עולם, since ‘[d]as Bedeutungsspektrum [von אמת] umfaßt die Aspekte der Festigkeit im Sinne von Beständigkeit, Sicherheit und Dauer, der Verlässlichkeit und der Treue. Darüber hinaus bezeichnet אמת auch die Grundlagen der kosmischen Ordnung,’ whereas עולם connotes ‘duration’ (‘Dauer’). She concludes that given this relationship, the fact that the revelation to Daniel is described as אמת does not only indicate its ‘reliability in the sense of a

That the remaining roughly 200 years' duration of the Persian Empire are dealt with in one verse shows the writer's emphasis. In God's sight, the Persians were already finished, though their empire had hardly begun to exist. Albani (2010:245) suggests, rightly in my opinion, that the historically inaccurate reference to four future Persian kings²¹⁸ is to be understood symbolically, the number four standing for totality (cf. Baldwin 1978:185; Lucas 2002:279; Wildgruber 2013:85).²¹⁹ Clifford (1975:24) remarks somewhat sarcastically that the 'glory of Persia is slighted by lumping ... the [first three] kings anonymously together' whereas 'the wealth of the fourth, his strength, serves only to excite the envy of the Greeks.'²²⁰ If a second century dating is assumed, it may also point to a total lack of interest in the Persian period.

A slightly different interpretation is offered by Steinmann (2008) who promotes the traditional date (6th-5th century BCE). In his opinion, Daniel 11:2b should be translated: 'As he becomes strong by his riches he will awaken everyone, [especially] the kingdom of Greece' (Steinmann 2008:508). He argues that *יָעִיר הַכֹּל אֶת מַלְכוּת יָוֶן* literally translated is 'he will arouse everyone, the kingdom of Greece,' noting that *אֶת מַלְכוּת יָוֶן* is the second direct object of *יָעִיר*, marked with the direct object marker (Steinmann 2008:510, note on 11:2). Steinmann (2008:519) argues that the king here is Xerxes, because 'it says that the fourth Persian king will stir up the kingdom of Greece.' He takes this to mean that when Xerxes was defeated by the then not yet united Greeks 'his invasion caused the Greeks to realize that they could be a united force' which 'eventually led to a united Greece under Philip of Macedon, whose son was Alexander the Great, whose conquests made Greece a

determined future, but also refers back to the hidden order that is combined with the perspective of durability' (Wildgruber 2013:263-264, my translation).

²¹⁸ There were in fact nine, excluding the usurpers between Cambyses and Darius I' (Baldwin 1978:185).

²¹⁹ Baldwin (1978:185) observes that the 'use of [the formula] *three ... and a fourth* is a familiar Hebraism' and suggests that the same idiom may have been employed here. 'The author would be deliberately vague in that case about the number of Persian kings to be expected, but the point is made that Persian wealth will eventually invite attack from all, even the kingdom of Greece' (Baldwin 1978:185). Lucas (2002:279), proposes that 'the expression seems to indicate the totality of examples,' and that here it might 'simply be summarizing the nature of the Persian Empire as rulers who amass wealth, grow strong and provoke conflict with the Greeks.' The picture which emerges about the Persian rulers is the same that appears 'throughout this prophetic survey of history. Kings grow strong, and as a result fall into a hubris that leads to disaster. Very often this comes about when they try to dominate others' (Lucas 2002:279). Wildgruber (2013:85) notes that the rule of the Persian kings is described in typological terms in which historically identifiable rulers are of no consequence (see also Wildgruber 2013:98).

²²⁰ Some scholars think that the four kings in view are the four that are mentioned in the Bible, namely Cyrus, Darius, Xerxes and Artaxerxes (cf. Collins 1993:377; Torrey 1946:1). However, since the angel explicitly refers to three *more* kings plus one that will come, it is unlikely that Cyrus is one of them. The last king, though the richest and mightiest of them all, is also the one under whom the empire will collapse in his mistaken effort to conquer Greece. It is not quite clear who this king is. Longman (1999:273) proposes 'Xerxes I (486-465 B.C.)' or 'Darius III (336-330 B.C.)'. The former was indeed rich, but failed to conquer Greece, 'being defeated at Salamis in 480 B.C., but his actions led to a Greek-Persian conflict that ended with Alexander' (Longman 1999:273). The latter, though not as rich as Xerxes, was the king who was in power when Alexander conquered Persia (Longman 1999:273; cf. Collins 1993:377, who prefers this view).

world empire’ (Steinmann 2008:518-519).²²¹ The suggestion is possible, but due to the general nature of the text cannot be ascertained.

2.4.3.3 The Short Rule of a Mighty King (11:3-4)

Daniel 11:3-4 describes the swift rise and fall of an unnamed mighty king, usually identified as Alexander the Great (e.g. Collins 1993:377). The angel goes quickly over the rise of the Greek empire under Alexander, designated the ‘mighty/warrior king’ (מְלִיךְ גִּבּוֹר) who ‘will rule with much sovereignty and do as he pleases/according to his pleasure’²²² (11:3, וּמְשָׁל מְמַשֵּׁל לְרַב וְעָשָׂה כְּרִצּוֹנוֹ, my translation; NASB ‘will rule with great authority’). The “king who does as he pleases” is a recurring motif in this chapter (Collins 1993:377), appearing at 11:3, 16 and 36.²²³ In reality, only God can really do as he pleases (cf. Jonah 1:14); humans might think they are able to do so, but they are only allowed to go as far as God will permit them to go.

Alexander’s rule was short-lived indeed.²²⁴ At the peak of his power he died in Babylon in 323 BCE, having conquered not only the Persian empire but also regions beyond to the Indus river. In the struggle for supremacy after his death his two sons and his nephew were killed and the realm was ultimately divided among his four generals (the Diadochi) into four major regions:²²⁵ ‘Macedon and Greece, Thrace, Syria and the east, and Egypt’ (Goldingay 1991:295). Baldwin (1978:186) aptly remarks that the ‘style of rule exercised by the successors of the Greek conqueror would differ from his, necessarily, because in a divided empire one leader would vie with another.’ This is evident in the

²²¹ In addition, in the introduction to this last vision, he argues that Daniel 11:2-12:4 is based on ‘a variation of a Wisdom technique: the *catchword*’ (Steinmann 2008:484; cf. also Steinmann 2005:198-200). He suggests (Steinmann 2008:484) that the catch words/concepts are: Greece (11:2), a Greek king/‘four winds of heaven’ (11:3-4), kings of two directions/the time of the end/those who have insight (11:5-35), and ‘the time of the end’/‘those who have insight’ (11:36-12:4).

²²² The word רִצּוֹן is often used in connection with people being acceptable before the Lord (e.g. Ex 28:38; Lv 1:3 etc.), or doing his will/pleasure (Ps 40:9). God bestows his favour on people (e.g. Ps 5:13). The idea that God does as he pleases is expressed with a different word, הִפִּיץ, cf. Jonah 1:14. Walker (1962:184) notes that the root רִצּוֹן ‘is two-sided, namely, *will* and *pleasure*, whether of oneself or another. Doing one’s own will and pleasure involves one’s own *desire*, but doing the will and pleasure of another results in *acceptance*, *approval*, *delight* of another, and his returning *favour* and *blessing*.’ In Daniel 11 the Greek kings only do their own will and pleasure, not that of another, least of all that of God!

²²³ Baldwin (1978:186) observes that the phrase indicates ‘at one and the same time ... personal success and culpable self-centredness.’ Stahl (1994:193) considers כְּרִצּוֹנוֹ one of the expressions of power used in this section, even if it is only short-lived. Lucas (2002:280) comments: ‘When, in their hubris, rulers think that they can do as they please, they are about to meet the nemesis of divine judgment.’

²²⁴ Hasslberger (1977:206) observes that the briefness of the reign is highlighted by the choice of expression in verse 4: וְכִמְעָדָה clearly refers back to וְעָמַד at the beginning of verse 3 and thus expresses the brevity of עָמַד there. He continues to argue (Hasslberger 1977:207) that תִּשְׁבֵּר is in the D-stem (i.e. Piel), but that is erroneous. The form is a Niphal imperfect, which in the present context has a passive function. I would agree with him, however, that the word intensifies the shortness of the reign, though not based on grammatical but lexical grounds. Incidentally, this Niphal is an example of what Meadowcroft (2004b:105-106) describes as an ‘apocalyptic passive.’

²²⁵ ‘The four winds of heaven’ is a figurative expression to indicate this (cf. Young 1949:233; Anderson 1984:130; Goldingay 1991:295).

report the angel gives of the account of the rulers of the kingdoms of the North and South, usually identified as (Seleucid) Syria and (Ptolemaic) Egypt, in the next section of his speech.

2.4.3.4 Continual Strife between the Kings of the South and the Kings of the North (11:5-20)

After reporting the death of the great king and the division of his kingdom ‘towards the four winds of heaven,’ the angel focuses in the rest of the vision/audition on two of these divisions, those in the north, with its rulers, the kings of the North, and the south, with its rulers, the kings of the South. There is continual conflict between these two, with the South first keeping the upper hand, but later the North becoming predominant. The report is kept deliberately vague and elusive without ever naming any of the opponents by name or proper title.²²⁶

It is generally agreed that Daniel 11:5-20 outlines in brief the history of the strife between the Ptolemaic (kings of the South, i.e. Egyptian) and Seleucid (kings of the North, i.e. Syrian) kingdoms, beginning with the split after Alexander’s death up to the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (cf. e.g. Miller 1994:293). The remarkable accuracy of these predictions has given rise to the common, though not universal, opinion that most of Daniel 11 is a *vaticinium ex eventu* prophecy, not true prediction (e.g. Goldingay 1991; Collins 1993; Seow 2003; to name but a few), although it is generally admitted that true (and in the opinion of many, failed) prediction happens after 11:35, or at least from 11:40 onwards, since it is believed that the death of the ‘King of the North’ that is predicted in these verses is that of Antiochus Epiphanes, who died in different circumstances from those outlined there. In this section the focus is on the rulers before Antiochus IV Epiphanes (or, less specifically, the worst of all the rulers predicted).

The text begins by noting how the King of the South will become strong, but one of his ‘princes’ will grow even stronger and ‘he will rule his dominion with much sovereignty.’²²⁷ Commentators usually observe that to begin with, the Ptolemies of Egypt were more powerful than the Seleucids of Syria (Dn 11:5-12). Daniel 11:5 is believed to summarize how Ptolemy I Soter, who ruled over Egypt from 323-285 BCE, was joined by the former Babylonian satrap Seleucus I Nicator who was ousted by Antigonus (Miller

²²⁶ Wildgruber (2013:150) correctly observes that most commentators and even translators are much too concrete where the original text seems deliberately vague and ambiguous.

²²⁷ My translation; note that the first three words of the phrase are exactly the same as in 11:3, וּמִשָּׁל מִמֶּשֶׁל רַב, but where verse 3 adds that the ruler will do as he pleases, here the writer adds the phrase וְשָׁלַט בְּרָצוֹן, hence my translation (cf. also Hasslberger 1977:211).

1994:293) and served for a time under Ptolemy (וּמִן־שָׂרָיו, ‘one of his princes’²²⁸). Seleucus was later able to return to Babylon, having defeated Antigonus with the help of Ptolemy (cf. Goldingay 1991:296), and increased both his territory and power so much²²⁹ (וַיִּזְזֶק עָלָיו) (וּמִשָּׁל מִמְּשָׁל רַב מִמְּשָׁלָתוֹ, Dn 11:5) that he ruled over a larger region than Ptolemy (cf. Steinmann 2008:522). His lands included Syria, Babylonia and Media (Goldingay 1991:296). Seleucus I remained in power until 280 BCE (Goldingay 1991:296).²³⁰

The continued strife between these two kingdoms is summarized in the following verses. Daniel 11:6 begins with an indefinite indication of time (cf. Hasslberger 1977:211), וּלְקֵץ שָׁנִים, lit. ‘and at the end of years,’ i.e. ‘after some years.’ The text assumes that there is some sort of disagreement which the two kings attempt to resolve through a ‘peaceful arrangement’ performed by the daughter of the King of the South,²³¹ but which ultimately failed. It is generally believed that this refers to Ptolemy II (who succeeded Ptolemy I) who made a peace treaty with the then reigning Seleucid king, Antiochus II Theos (about 250 BCE, Steinmann 2008:522). To seal the treaty, Ptolemy’s daughter Berenice, was given in marriage to Antiochus, but he already had a wife, Laodice, whom he divorced. However, sometime later Antiochus took back his first wife. Soon afterwards Antiochus died, and Laodice apparently murdered Berenice, her son and a number of Berenice’s attendants in order to make sure that her own son would succeed to the Seleucid throne. Berenice’s father also died (cf. Dn 11:6; Collins 1993:378).²³²

Daniel 11:7-9 reports that one of the descendants of the daughter of the King of the South will rise up and wage war against the King of the North, taking as spoil their gods and their images back to Egypt, but then not attacking any more for some time. Verse 9 briefly outlines how the King of the North will attack the King of the South, but return quickly. The reader is not told whether or not the campaign was successful. This section apparently covers a couple of episodes during the reign of Ptolemy III Euergetes (246-227

²²⁸ Note that here ‘prince’ definitely refers to a human figure, unlike in chapter 10 where the context indicates a supernatural being.

²²⁹ By taking over Antigonus’ territory (Steinmann 2008:522).

²³⁰ Wildgruber (2013:101) does not agree with this report of events. She finds the identification of the second ruler in verse 5 with Seleucus Nicator unsatisfactory and argues that since verse 6 continues with a description of a marriage alliance between the kings of the North and South, it is plausible that the second king in verse 5 is also a King of the North (Wildgruber 2013:101). However, this does not take into account the fact that the second ruler is introduced as וּמִן־שָׂרָיו, ‘one of his princes,’ which is unlikely to refer to a northern king. Therefore, the traditional interpretation is more likely.

²³¹ Daniel 11:6; וּבִת מַלְכָּה־הַיָּמִינִים תָּבוֹא אֶל־מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן לַעֲשׂוֹת מִישָׂרִים, ‘and the daughter of the King of the South will come to the King of the North to carry out a peaceful arrangement’ (NASB).

²³² ‘But she will not retain her position of power, nor will he stand nor his might; and she and those who brought her [‘her supporters’ NLT] and he who sired her and who strengthened her in those days were given over’ (וְלֹא־תַעֲצֹר כֹּחַ) (וְהַיָּרֵעַ וְלֹא יַעֲמֹד וְיִרְעֻוּ וְתִתְּנוּ הִיא וּמְבִיאֶיהָ וְהַיָּלִידָהּ וּמְחַזְקֶיהָ בְּעֵתָם; Dn 11:6; my translation). Wildgruber (2013:102) rightly notes that the Hebrew text is much more subtle and enigmatic than this interpretation, which moreover jumps from one generation of rulers to the next. She also remarks that many of the historical details mentioned in other commentaries are ultimately based on Jerome’s Commentary on Daniel and his refutation of Porphyry (Wildgruber 2013:92).

BCE), who invaded Syria, killed Laodice, and, after taking ‘control of the major ports of Antioch and Seleucia’ (Lucas 2002:280), took the statues of the gods of Egypt that had been carried away by Cambyses two centuries earlier and brought them back to Egypt. This earned him the title ‘Euergetes,’ i.e. ‘Benefactor’ (cf. Collins 1993:378). However, having received news of a revolt in Egypt he had to return and was not able to conquer Syria completely. As a result, Seleucus II regained control over his territory, and some time later in turn attacked Egypt (ca. 242 BCE, cf. Seow 2004:172), though this was unsuccessful and he had to retreat (וַיָּשָׁב אֶל־אֲדָמָהוּ, v. 9; Seow 2004:172). Collins (1993:278) observes that ‘the explicit mention of Egypt’ in verse 8 ‘is exceptional in the MT but occurs several times in the OG.’

In Daniel 11:10-19 the focus shifts from the kings of the South to the kings of the North. The descendants (lit. ‘sons’) of the King of the North mentioned in verse 9 will engage in warfare against the King of the South, an event that is described in terms of a great force/army that will ‘flood over’ (רָשַׁע, a word that is repeated a few times in this chapter) the latter’s territory (v. 10). In the ensuing battle the King of the North will be ‘given over’ into the hands of the King of the South (v. 11; though God is not mentioned, it is implied by the passive construction that he is the driving power behind this defeat).

The general interpretation of these verses is that after Seleucus II’s death his son Seleucus III came to the throne (226 BCE). He was murdered after three years and succeeded by his brother Antiochus III (‘the Great’; cf. Collins 1993:378). Both Seleucus III and Antiochus III continued to wage war against the Ptolemies (Dn 11:10-19). The amount of space given to the description of these wars indicates their importance for the author. Longman (1999:275) rightly observes that the relatively detailed description of Antiochus III’s wars with Egypt probably ‘has much to do with the fact that it was through his agency that Palestine finally shifted from Ptolemaic control to Seleucid control.’ Collins (1993:378) notes that it was Antiochus who would “‘come, overwhelm [lit. flood, overflow], and pass over” in v 10b.’ Antiochus took advantage of the rise to power by Ptolemy IV and ‘recaptured Seleucia, the port of Antioch’ and the rest of Coele-Syria (219-218 BCE; Collins 1993:378). The expression ‘flood/overflow and pass over’ (וַיָּשָׁב רָשַׁע, 11:10) is also used in Isaiah 8:8, there for the Assyrians (cf. Collins 1993:378), and is probably meant to indicate the severity of the situation. It is not certain to what the expression עַד־מִצְדָּה (‘to his fortress, Dn 11:10) refers, whether ‘to a particular place, or simply to Egypt’ (Lucas 2002:281), or whether it is to be taken ‘as a pun on Gaza, a stronghold of Antiochus’ (Collins 1993:379, quoting Driver 1922:170; cf. also Longman 1999:275). Perhaps a reference to Egypt makes most sense in the context.

The reference of the obscure passage in Daniel 11:11-13 is probably the Egyptian retaliation and victory at the battle of Raphia under Ptolemy IV, but the vagueness of the text makes certainty impossible.²³³ At this battle, Antiochus lost more than 17000 men (217 BCE; Dn 11:11; cf. Collins 1993:379), but Ptolemy ‘was not strengthened’ (Collins 1993:379). A number of insurrections followed in Egypt, and eventually Ptolemy ‘died in 203 B.C.E. under mysterious circumstances’ (Seow 2003:173) and was succeeded by his six year old son Ptolemy V Epiphanes. In the meantime, Antiochus III had used the internal struggles of Egypt to gain back much of the previously lost territory, including Coele-Syria, though the Egyptians fought hard, and there were a number of reversals during this time of war. At the battle of ‘Paneas (later Caesarea Philippi) ... in 200 B.C.E. ... Judea passed finally from Ptolemaic to Seleucid control’ (Collins 1993:379; cf. Dn 11:12-13), and this is of course the focus of the rest of Daniel 11. Wildgruber (2013:105-106) is probably rightly critical of the identification of verses 12-13 with these events. She notes that the text refers neither to the Asian wars of Antiochus the Great (212-205 BCE) nor does it leave any traces of the battle at Paneas (Wildgruber 2013:106). Indeed, verse 13 simply states that after some years the King of the North will raise another, even greater army (than that mentioned in verse 11) and set out for war.

Collins (1993:379) and Longman (1999:277) both comment on the obscurity of Daniel 11:14, though the general thrust of the verse²³⁴ seems to be that the Jews were divided as to whom to support, the King of the South (Ptolemies) or the King of the North (Seleucids). Collins (1993:379) observes that the expression *וּבְנֵי פְרִיצֵי עַמּוֹךְ*, literally ‘the sons of the violent ones among your people,’ ‘implies a negative evaluation’ on the part of the writer.²³⁵ Miller (1994:295) explains that the Oniads who ‘controlled the high priesthood ... supported Egyptian rule,’ whereas the Tobiads, ‘a politically powerful family related to the Oniads, leaned in the opposite direction.’ Some people may have even taken Daniel’s prophecies to heart and thought that the time of the end of foreign

²³³ ‘And the King of the South will become furious and go forth and fight with him, with the King of the North. But he [i.e. the King of the North] will raise up a great multitude, but it will be given into his [i.e. the King of the South’s] hand. And the multitude will be carried away, and his heart will be exalted and he will cause ten thousands to fall, but he will not be strong. But the King of the North will turn and raise an even bigger multitude than before. Then after a few years (lit. at the end of times, years) he will come [back], coming with a great army and much equipment’ (Dn 11:11-13; my translation, but cf. NASB).

²³⁴ It reads: ‘Now in those times many will rise up against the King of the South; the violent ones among your people will also lift themselves up in order to fulfill the vision, but they will fall down’ (NASB; Hebrew: *וּבְעֵתֵים הָהֵם יָרִיבִים וְיָקִימוּ עַל־מַלְכוּת הַמֶּלֶךְ הַגָּבֹהַּ וּבְנֵי פְרִיצֵי עַמּוֹךְ יִשְׁעֹזוּ לְהַעֲמִיד חֲזוֹן וְיִנְכַשְׁלוּ*).

²³⁵ Miller (1994:295), in line with the definitions in BDB and HALOT, notes that elsewhere in the OT the term *פְּרִיצֵי* refers to ‘robbers and murderers.’ Longman (1999:276) says that while it is impossible to say to whom this term refers, ‘we do know there were political power plays going on at the time in Jerusalem.’

oppression was near, and thus took matters into their own hands, but failed (Miller 1994:295),²³⁶ but this is uncertain.

Daniel 11:15 probably refers to Antiochus' pursuit of the Ptolemaic general Scopas to Sidon (Longman 1999:276; Collins 1993:380). The expression וְעַם מִבְּחַרֵּיהֶם ('their choicest troops,' NASB) is, according to Collins (1993:380), a 'reference ... to Scopas' Aetolian mercenaries.' However, these people will not have the strength to stand, וְאֵין כֹּחַ לְעִמָּוָה. Baldwin (1978:188) astutely comments that 'behind the passive verb lies God's active will, putting down one [ruler] and setting up another.' This of course has been evident throughout the book, but is explicitly stated in Daniel 2:21: 'It is He who changes the times and the epochs; He removes kings and establishes kings' (NASB; Aramaic: וְהוּאֵ מְלַכֵּי וְהוּאֵ מְלַכֵּי וְהוּאֵ מְלַכֵּי וְהוּאֵ מְלַכֵּי).

The phrase וְיָעֵשׂ ... פְּרָצוֹנוֹ at the beginning of Daniel 11:16 is a stock phrase that is applied here to Antiochus III.²³⁷ Antiochus III apparently received a great reception when he came to Jerusalem (Josephus, Ant. 12.3.3 § 138), as many people considered him their 'deliverer and benefactor' (Miller 1994:296), though he punished the pro-Egyptian Jews. Thus he stood 'in the land of beauty' (בְּאַרְצֵי הַיְפָאִי; cf. Dn 11:41), i.e. Judah.

The last phrase of Daniel 11:16, וְכָל־הָאָרֶץ בְּיָדוֹ, 'and it will all be in his hand,' as Collins (1993:381), who translates it thus, observes, indicates that from this time onwards, 'Palestine remained under Seleucid control.' However, כָּל־הָאָרֶץ means, according to HALOT, mainly destruction. Thus most Bible translations, including NASB, NKJV and ESV, actually translate כָּל־הָאָרֶץ בְּיָדוֹ 'destruction [was] in his hand/power' (see also Wildgruber 2013:16). Miller (1994:296) observes that this 'most likely means that Antiochus had "complete" power over the land.' Both interpretations make sense in the context,²³⁸ but the latter of course points forward to the destruction that would be wreaked by the last and most wicked of the kings of the North who is the focus of Daniel 11:21 onwards. Thus the stage is set for this evil future ruler (cf. Miller 1994:296). But before turning his attention to this man, the angel gives a few more details concerning the previous ruler's rule (i.e. Antiochus the Great's).

Daniel 11:17 states that the King of the North (lit. 'he') will 'set his face to come with the power of his whole kingdom, bringing with him a proposal of peace which he will

²³⁶ Collins (1993:380) notes that this last suggestion is difficult to uphold since there is no evidence historically concerning a revolt by a Jewish messianic group at that time.

²³⁷ In 11:3 it refers to Alexander the Great, and in 11:36 to the last King of the North, i.e. Antiochus Epiphanes (Collins 1993:380) or the Antichrist (depending on one's interpretation of that verse).

²³⁸ Perhaps the author deliberately used a word that could be interpreted either way.

put into effect; he will also give him the daughter of women to ruin it' (NASB). But he will not succeed, because the 'daughter of women' will 'not stand nor be for him' (my translation). Steinmann (2008:524) and Goldingay (1991:298) both comment that Antiochus refrained from further military action against Egypt because of the awakening might of Rome in the west, and rather tried to gain control over Egypt by marriage alliance, giving his daughter Cleopatra to Ptolemy V as a wife. However, the plan was thwarted since 'Cleopatra became steadfastly loyal to her husband' (Steinmann 2008:524) and did 'not stand' up for her father nor was she working 'for him' (וְלֹא תַעֲמֹד וְלֹא-לְוֹ תִהְיֶה), Dn 11:17). Perhaps to make up for this loss, Antiochus III turned his eye towards the 'coastlands' (Dn 11:18), 'taking islands in the Aegean and campaigning in Thrace in 196' BCE (Steinmann 2008:524).²³⁹

Daniel 11:19 goes on to describe how the King of the North then will turn 'his face towards the fortresses of his own land' (NIV), but whatever his purpose is in doing so (this is not stated), he will 'totter and fall and not be found' (my translation). Most commentators suggest that this refers to Antiochus III who, though he had been warned by Rome not to attack Greece, did so, and was decisively defeated by a Roman-Greek alliance at Thermopylae in 191 BCE and again at Magnesia in 190 BCE (Steinmann 2008:524). Two years later, Antiochus III was forced to sign a peace treaty with Rome at Apamea, thus becoming a Roman vassal. The terms of this treaty included the payment of a severe tribute and the stipulation that he send twenty hostages to Rome, including his son, Antiochus IV (Dn 11:18; Steinmann 2008:524-25; Goldingay 1991:298; Polybius *Histories* 21.7). After this, Antiochus III, having to raise money for the tribute, turned to 'Syria, Mesopotamia and beyond' (Steinmann 2008:525), but when he attempted to rob the temple of Zeus in Elymais, the irate crowd of citizens rose up against him to defend the temple, and in the process Antiochus and many of his soldiers were killed (Steinmann 2008:525; Dn 11:19: 'and he was not found anymore'). Wildgruber (2013:110) aptly comments that this explanation is much more concrete and detailed than the rather vague Hebrew text implies.

Daniel 11:20 tells of the successor to the figure who was 'found no more' (Dn 11:19). This man will cause an oppressor to pass through the 'splendour of a kingdom' (literal translation) but within a very short time (וּבְיָמִים אָחָדִים, 'within a few days,' NASB)

²³⁹ The last phrase of verse 18 is rather obscure: וְהַשְׂבִּית קִצְיוֹן תְּרַפְתּוֹ לִּי בְלִתִּי תְרַפְתּוֹ יָשִׁיב לִּי, i.e. 'and a commander will stop his scorn to him, so that his scorn will not return to him' (my translation; cf. Wildgruber 2013:18, who argues that this means that the scorn of the King of the North will be stopped in such a way that he will not be able to repeat or continue it). The קִצְיוֹן mentioned here is thought to have been the Roman consul Lucius Cornelius Scipio who was the commander of the Roman army at Magnesia (cf. Collins 1993:381).

he will be ‘broken’, though ‘not in anger nor in battle’ (NASB; Dn 11:20).²⁴⁰ Once again the passive construction of the Hebrew indicates divine action. The text is usually identified with the events surrounding Antiochus III’s succession by Seleucus IV Philopator, his son (187-175 BCE; Miller 1994:297; Steinmann 2008:525). Seleucus IV had inherited not only the throne, but also the heavy debts to Rome. In order to come up with the payments, he ‘sent his finance minister, Heliodorus, to Jerusalem in order to seize the wealth of the temple treasury’ (Steinmann 2008:525; cf. Dn 11:20, ‘the oppressor’ who ‘passed through [the] splendour of [the] kingdom’), but according to 2 Maccabees 3 he was unsuccessful since Heliodorus saw an apparition of angels that chastised him in such a way as to persuade him not to take the temple treasure.²⁴¹ Seleucus IV died after 12 years, apparently having been poisoned by Heliodorus who hoped to succeed to the throne (cf. Steinmann 2008:525). Miller (1994:297) suggests that Heliodorus may have been assisted by Antiochus IV in this endeavour, though how that could be so is difficult to say since Antiochus IV was in Athens at the time (Steinmann 2008:525). In any case, the way for Antiochus IV to take the throne was free.

2.4.3.5 The Rise and Demise of the ‘Despicable Person’ (11:21-45)

This section is clearly the climax of the chapter, as indicated by the amount of space dedicated to the reign of this ‘despicable person’ (Dn 11:21; NASB).²⁴² Scholars are universally agreed that this man was Antiochus IV Epiphanes (Baldwin 1978:191), nicknamed Epimanes – the madman (cf. Polybius, *Histories*, 26.1.). But Baldwin (1978:191) rightly suggests that there is more behind Daniel 11, and this section in that chapter, than a mere account of history. Throughout the book the reader has been made aware of the fact that those who believe in God will face opposition. Sometimes, this opposition can be overcome and the believer is able to live peacefully (though never completely unchallenged) in the secular world (Dn 1-2, 4-5), but at other times, hinted at already in chapters 3 and 6, but clearly expressed in all the visions (Dn 7-12), no accommodation is possible, and severe persecution will result. In such difficult times, the believer is called upon to persevere and not give up. Baldwin (1978:192) rightly notes that this chapter ‘speaks to generations of believers and is not confined in its scope to the

²⁴⁰ Hebrew: וְעָמַד עַל-פָּנָיו מִעֲבִיר נֹגֵשׁ הָדָר מִלְּבוֹת וּבְגִמִּים אֲהָדִים יִשְׁבֵּר וְלֹא בְּאַפִּים וְלֹא בְּמִלְחָמָה.

²⁴¹ Baldwin (1978:189) suggests a possible connection to Zechariah 9:8, which is similar in wording to Daniel 11:20: ‘מִעֲבִיר נֹגֵשׁ הָדָר מִלְּבוֹת וְלֹא יֵעָבֵר עֲלֵיהֶם עוֹד נֹגֵשׁ’.

²⁴² Hartman & DiLella (1978:269) suggest that in the context the word נְבוֹהָ refers to the low origin of Antiochus. However, I believe Page (1996:193, n. 379) is right in asserting that the word rather points to the unfavourable opinion of Antiochus by the populace, and that the writer expressed his ‘total disdain for the king’s legitimacy as heir and complete disgust with regard to his official policies.’ This is also proved by the nickname ‘Epimanes,’ ‘madman,’ that Antiochus was given.

second century BC. ... Antiochus is the prototype of many [persecutors] who will come after him, hence the interest shown here in his methods and progress.²⁴³

The content of Daniel 11:21-45 may be outlined briefly as follows:

1. The new ruler's rise to power by stealth – ignominious start (11:21-23)
2. War with the King of the South – success (11:24-27)
3. General measures against Jewish religion (11:28)
4. War with the King of the South – failure due to the intervention of the 'Kittim' (11:29-30)
5. Measures against religion in general (11:31-38)
 - 5.1. Measures against Jewish religion – severe persecution (11:31)
 - 5.2. The fate of faithful Jews versus that of apostates during the time of persecution (11:32-35)
 - 5.3. Measures against all religions (11:36-38)
6. War with nations, including the King of the South (11:39-44)
7. The king's demise – ignominious end (11:45)

I believe that the whole section is marked by an *inclusio*, i.e. the ignominious start and end of this man's rule, and the middle sections alternate, giving reports regarding wars with the King of the South and others and measures against Jews and/or religious people in general, whereby the last section on measures against religion receives a special focus as indicated by the amount of space, 8 verses, accorded this part. Chapter 12:1-4 concludes the whole prophecy by focusing in detail on the 'time of the end' and its consequences for the participants in the drama related in Daniel 11:21-45, and instructing Daniel what to do with the message he has just been given.

2.4.3.5.1 The New Ruler's Rise to Power by Stealth – Ignominious Start (11:21-23)

In place of the previous king who sent an oppressor through the land, another man termed 'despicable person' (נִבְזָה, Niph pt ms בזה, 'despised, contemptible,' HALOT) will arise (וְעָמַד עַל־כְּפוֹ נִבְזָה, 11:21). He is so named because of the way he comes to power, namely through intrigue (הִלְקֵלְקוֹת) and self-appointment (וְלֹא־נָתַנוּ עָלָיו הַיּוֹד מַלְכוּת), 'but they will not give him the honour of kingship'. He will get rid of 'overflowing forces' (וַיִּזְרְעוּת הַשָּׂטָף) (יִשְׁטְפוּ מִלְפָּנָיו) as well as '[the] prince of [the] covenant' (נִגְיֵד בְּרִית) (Dn 11:22; see below) and make some sort of alliance with a group that is not identified (Dn 11:23). This 'despicable person' will practice deceit (מְרָמָה) and gain power (Dn 11:23). These events are usually identified with the coming into power of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

²⁴³ Meadowcroft (2004b:108) notes how especially verses 40-45 'stand between the historical present and the culmination of history.'

Antiochus was able to leave Rome because he was exchanged for Seleucus' son, Demetrius I (Miller 1994:298), who was the rightful heir to the throne. He went to Greece, but when he heard about Seleucus' death he raised an army and advanced on Babylon (Steinmann 2008:525), and then went to Palestine to take his brother's throne, which had been occupied for a short while by Heliodorus. Heliodorus fled, and Antiochus became the ruler of the country, 'ostensibly as regent in place of his nephew Demetrius, and with his younger nephew Antiochus (an infant) as coregent' (Steinmann 2008:525; cf. also Goldingay 1991:299; Lucas 2002:283). This nephew was murdered a few years later, in 170 BCE (Lucas 2002:283), thus leaving Antiochus IV Epiphanes as the sole ruler. Miller (1994:298) rightly suggests that the expression 'he will come in a time of tranquility and seize the kingdom by intrigue' (NASB, Dn 11:21; וַיָּבֵא בְּשֵׁלְוָה וְהִתְזַנֵּק מִלְּבוֹת בְּהַלְקָלוֹת) could mean 'unawares' (NLT: 'when least expected') and suggests that both 'ideas of false security [by Heliodorus and his supporters] and stealth may be involved.' Thus Antiochus IV's accession fits the description of Daniel 11:21 admirably: the new ruler was not the next in line for the throne, and the role of king was not given to him, but he took it for himself 'by intrigue,' or, more literally, 'smooth things.'²⁴⁴

Daniel 11:22 is the first verse in this vision where the term בְּרִית occurs. Collins (1993:382) suggests this verse is a 'general introductory statement that anticipates the effect of Antiochus' reign.' The text begins with the rather enigmatic statement that the 'overflowing forces will be flooded away before him and shattered' (וַיִּרְעוּת הַנְּשֹׁטָף יִשְׁטָפוּ) (my translation). In other words, he will get rid of whatever (and whoever, as the end of the verse indicates) stands in his way with little effort.

Goldingay (1991:299) suggests that the 'overwhelming forces' could refer to 'rivals to the throne,' one of whom 'was Ptolemy VI of Egypt, son of Seleucus' and Antiochus' sister Cleopatra.'²⁴⁵ He further opines that the language in this verse 'suggests a reference to the conflict with Egypt that is a main feature of Antiochus' reign' (Goldingay 1991:299), but Steinmann (2008:525) rightly argues against this, saying that the 'King of the South' is not mentioned in this verse and that the reference is more likely to be the local enemies Antiochus defeated (cf. Anderson 1984:135; Collins 1993:382, n.

²⁴⁴ הַלְקָלוֹת only occurs four times in the MT, in Jeremiah 23:12, Psalm 35:6, and Daniel 11:21 and 34. BDB lists the meanings as 'smoothness, slipperiness, fine promises,' and HALOT gives 'smooth portions' (of road) and 'intrigue.' Page (1996:193, n. 381) points out that in Psalm 35:6 and Jeremiah 23:12 the word 'is used with particular reference to treacherous footing.' This would make good sense here. Schunck (1980:445) lists the meaning in the present context as 'deceit,' 'hypocrisy' and 'being deceitful or hypocritical.' The related root חלק appears fifteen times in the DSS, six of which are in the 4QpNah, all referring to the 'seekers after smooth things,' apparently an epithet for the Pharisees and their false (in the eyes of the DSS community) teachings, and three in 1QH^a where the term refers to flattering speech (in the negative sense). According to Luc (1997a:161, cf. Schiffman 1990:24), the 'Qumran sect obviously intended a play on words, replacing *hlkt* "laws" with *hlqt* to scorn the Pharisees for being those who introduced new and false laws in their teaching of Scripture.'

²⁴⁵ This interpretation was already given by Theodoret of Cyrus (cf. Stevenson & Glerup 2008:291).

117). Lucas (2002:284) insightfully mentions an allusion to Isaiah 10:22-23 and 28:15-22 where שָׁטָף refers to the Assyrian invasion to be expected, saying that ‘Antiochus is the “new Assyria”, bringing havoc to Judea’ (Lucas 2002:284). The point is that the effect of this new ruler’s reign is like that of a devastating flood that leaves nothing but destruction in its wake. The following description of his ‘achievements’ (if they can be called this) gives ample evidence of this judgment.

Included in this sweeping destruction of all opposing forces is ‘a prince of a covenant’ (וְנָגִיד בְּרִית). This is as enigmatic a statement as the beginning of Daniel 11:22. To whom does it refer: a secular leader, a covenant partner of the new ruler who is being deposed, or a religious leader (see the discussion on נָגִיד at 9:25 above)? What covenant is being referred to? It is significant that the reference is to ‘a leader,’ not ‘the leader,’ as the definite article is lacking.²⁴⁶ Thus it is at least possible that the reference is not to a particular leader, but to anyone in the office so designated. Steinmann (2008:526) also suggests that the indefinite expression ‘may be a subtle prediction that there would be two or three competing occupants of the high priestly office, none of whom could rightly be called by the more definite “the leader of the covenant”’ (italics his).

If ‘covenant’ refers to an alliance with a secular power, וְנָגִיד בְּרִית must refer to the general or political leader of that power. Miller (1994:299) for example takes it this way, arguing that the expression refers to Ptolemy VI with whom Antiochus made a treaty in order to help him regain his throne which he (Ptolemy) had lost to his younger brother. But later that treaty was broken when Ptolemy VI made peace with his brother and allied himself with him against Antiochus (Miller 1994:299). The grammatical construction without the definite article seems to support the identification Miller makes. The verb used for ‘making an alliance’ (Hitp inf cons חָבַר, Dn 11:23) and the word for nation, גּוֹי, also appears to favour it. However, Steinmann (2008:526) rejects this interpretation because of the reference in verse 23 to a ‘small nation’ which in his opinion cannot be explained if the ‘prince of a covenant’ is the ruler of Egypt (Egypt is not *small*). In addition, he says, all other references to covenant in this chapter (11:28, 30, 32)²⁴⁷ are also without the definite article, but they all refer to the (holy) covenant of God with his people (Steinmann 2008:526).

If ‘covenant’ is considered to mean the Mosaic covenant (as an extension of the Abrahamic covenant), וְנָגִיד most likely refers to a Jewish functionary, i.e. a national leader

²⁴⁶ Cf. Hasslberger (1977:249), who correctly notes that all occurrences of בְּרִית in this section are indefinite.

²⁴⁷ See also 9:27 where the same expression is used without the article.

or, more likely in the circumstances, a religious leader, i.e. the current high priest.²⁴⁸ One might even argue that the *בְּרִית* in this context is not the Mosaic covenant in general, but the covenant with the priesthood which is first mentioned in Numbers 25, or the Davidic covenant if *נָגִיד* is perceived to be a royal figure.

Most scholars take the reference to be to a religious leader and believe that the reference in Daniel 11:22 is to the death of the high priest Onias III (e.g. Porteous 1965:166; Collins 1993:382; et al.). Steinmann (2008:526) explains that though Antiochus III had agreed to let the Jews exercise some right of self-government through their religious leaders according to their laws, Antiochus IV was ‘at odds with Onias III because this high priest was opposed to the growing influence of Hellenism in Palestine.’ Thus, when Jason, Onias’ brother, offered not only a large bribe for the office, but also the promise to pursue active Hellenization in Judea, Antiochus IV accepted and appointed Jason to the high priesthood instead of Onias (Steinmann 2008:526). So began the sale to the highest bidder of the office of high priest, since a few years later Menelaus offered an even higher price for the post, which allowed him to displace Jason though Menelaus was not of high priestly descent. When Onias protested against Menelaus’ abuse of office (cf. 2 Macc 4:32-33), he was murdered, and this is commonly seen as the reference in Daniel 11:22 (cf. Steinmann 2008:526). Wildgruber (2013:111-112) however comments that a reference to Onias’ death is problematic, because the verb *שָׁבַר* may refer to his removal from office rather than his death.

Keil & Delitzsch (1996:796) do not accept either of these suggestions but argue that due to the general nature of the text the expression *נָגִיד בְּרִית* (‘a covenant prince,’ not ‘the covenant prince’) should be taken as a reference to some covenant prince in general, rather than a particular person. Nevertheless, since *נָגִיד* in later biblical usage can refer to a religious leader, the identification with Onias is perhaps to be preferred (no matter whether his death or his dismissal from office is in view), even though other referents in later history need not be ruled out altogether. The vagueness of the text certainly allows for either a political or a religious figure.

Daniel 11:23 continues by stating that ‘[a]fter an alliance is made with him he will practice deception, and he will go up and gain power with a small *force of people*’ (NASB). The Hebrew word translated ‘making an alliance’ is the Hithpael infinitive construct of *הִבָּר* (‘ally oneself together, join forces’ HALOT), which refers to alliances with foreign rulers in Daniel 11:6 and 2 Chronicles 20:35-37. To whom this alliance refers

²⁴⁸ See the more detailed discussion on the word *נָגִיד* at 9:25 above.

in the present verse is uncertain. Collins (1993:382) thinks it is a treaty which Antiochus made with Pergamum and which allowed him ‘to gain power with a small force.’ Others think it was the alliances with the different high priests (Onias III, Jason, Menelaus; cf. the summary in Lucas 2002:284), who may perhaps be considered ‘foreign’ rulers, since they belonged to those Jews who tried to come to grips with the occupying power. Since the text is very obscure indeed, a mediating position appears to be justified and it is perhaps best to argue with Slotki (1951:94) that these ‘words may speak in a general way of Antiochus’ treatment of his allies,’ whoever they were (cf. Baldwin 1978:192; Reditt 1999:181).

2.4.3.5.2 War with the King of the South – Success (11:24-27)

The next verse (Dn 11:24) indicates how this ruler did indeed become so powerful that he surpassed his forefathers in what he achieved: ‘Without warning/with ease²⁴⁹ and with fat/stout/rich ones of a province he will come and will do/achieve what neither his fathers nor his father’s fathers have done/achieved. Plunder, spoil and possessions he will scatter among them, and against fortifications he will make plans, but (only) up to a time’ (Dn 11:24, my translation). The translation ‘fat/stout/rich ones’ must be explained. The word מְשִׁמְנֵי only occurs four times in the MT, in Is 10:16; 17:4, Ps 78:31 and here. In Is 10:16 and Ps 78:31 the translators of the NASB have translated it ‘stout warriors’ and ‘stoutest ones’ respectively. My suggestion therefore is that in Daniel 11:24 it could possibly also be translated in this way. This would retain the word order of the Hebrew and account for the conjunction between בְּשִׁלְוָה and בְּמִשְׁמַנֵּי²⁵⁰ (cf. Seow 2003:177). It would also make sense in terms of the rest of the verse, which speaks about the distribution of plunder, spoil and possessions ‘among *them*,’ which is inexplicable in translations that explain this as an invasion into some land (cf. also Hasslberger 1977:253 who argues along the same lines). The personal pronoun ‘them’ would, according to the suggested translation, refer to these choice warriors/men. The following verse speaks of the large army gathered by the King of the North against the King of the South, and the present verse may well point to that.

Goldingay (1991:273)²⁵¹ similarly translates the phrase וּבְמִשְׁמַנֵּי מְדִינָה ‘powerful ones of a province.’ He comments that this translation ‘best fits the context of vv 23-24’ (Goldingay 1991:279, n. 24.b), and in his commentary on the verse he notes that ‘while

²⁴⁹ Following the definitions for שלוה (under שלה) suggested by Grünwaldt (2006:10-11).

²⁵⁰ Slotki (1951:95), in a note on verse 24 observes that ‘the fattest places’ is an ‘improbable rendering of *mishmannē*,’ which in his opinion (which I accept) is better translated (with Bevan 1892:188) “‘the mightiest men of (each) province,” viz. his personal enemies.’

²⁵¹ See also Wildgruber’s (2013:19) translation of verse 24 and note 54 explaining her choice in similar terms.

Antiochus began with only the support of “a small group” (v 23), in Judea he won over the “powerful ones of a province,” the Tobiads and Jason, Onias’s brother. ... and it is presumably they who are the beneficiaries of his well-known liberality on the basis of plunder’ (Goldingay 1991:299-300). Baldwin (1978:192-193) argues likewise. The remark that this king will make plans against fortifications probably refers to Antiochus’ wars against Egypt which are outlined in more detail in the following verses (cf. Steinmann 2008:527). However, the angelic interpreter tells Daniel that these schemes will only last ‘for a time’ (וְעַד-עֵת). In other words, God is in control even of the actions and plans of wicked rulers like Antiochus Epiphanes.

Daniel 11:25-27 deals in more detail with the wars between the kings of the North and South, i.e. the Seleucids and the Ptolemies during Antiochus IV’s reign. Verse 25 notes that the King of the North will ‘stir up his strength and his heart against the King of the South with a great army’ (בְּתַהוֹל גָּדוֹל). The King of the South, in turn, will ‘engage in strife for war with a great and exceedingly vast army’ (בְּתַהוֹל-גָּדוֹל וְעֲצוּמַת עַד-מְאֹד; my translation). This choice of words coincides with the observations of Polybius (*Histories*, 27.19) that it was apparently the King of the South who instigated the war, and it is possible that Antiochus’ campaign ‘was ... a preemptive strike against’ this (Longman 1999:279). However, despite his ‘great and exceedingly vast army’ Ptolemy VI did not succeed in taking Syria and Palestine (וְלֹא יַעֲמִד; cf. Miller 1994:300), because someone (presumably the King of the North) ‘devised plans against him’ (כִּי-יִהְיֶה שָׂבוּר עָלָיו מִחֲשָׁבוֹת), and ‘even those who ate his delicacies destroyed him’ (v 26, my translation; וְאֵכְלֵי פֶת־בָּגֵי וְיִשְׁבְּרוּהוּ; cf. Baldwin 1978:193), an act of utmost treachery, not only by middle eastern standards. This probably refers to the fact that Ptolemy VI was still very young at this stage and the power of the kingdom was effectively in the hands of his advisors, Eulaeus and Lenaeus. They suggested he try to recapture Syria and Palestine. When the two armies met near Pelusium (169 BCE) Antiochus defeated Ptolemy’s army and managed to occupy a large part of Egypt. Alexandria, however, was not captured. In fact, the leaders of that city declared Ptolemy VI’s brother, Ptolemy VII, king.

Antiochus apparently offered his help to the deposed Ptolemy VI, making an alliance with him, but he was no more than Antiochus’ puppet (Lucas 2002:285). This is probably what is referred to in Daniel 11:27 where we are told that the kings of the South and the North ‘will speak lies to each other at the same table’ (NASB; cf. Lucas 2002:285). However, the writer also adds that all this scheming ‘will not succeed’ (וְלֹא תִצְלַח) ‘for there is still an end at the appointed time’ (כִּי עוֹד לְהַגִּץ לְמוֹעֵד; my translation). The implied idea is that though this ruler thinks he can do what he likes, when he likes and how long he likes, God is in control, and the end, both of Antiochus as well as any other

(future) ruler acting in a similar manner, is already appointed and fixed (cf. Steinmann 2008:528).

2.4.3.5.3 Excursus: The Expressions מועד and קץ in Daniel 11-12

The reference to an ‘appointed time’ (מועד) is repeated twice in Daniel 11 (Dn 11:29, 35) and appears also in 12:7, showing that this is an important concept in this vision. Wildgruber (2013:223) rightly observes that the time references in this last section and for the last king differ from those used for the previous kings. The passing of time is perceived differently for this ruler (Wildgruber 2013:223). Whereas before words such as ‘years’ and ‘days’, i.e. limited but definite, though unspecified, time periods, are used, now the author uses terms that mark a definite point in time, though still not exactly defined (Wildgruber 2013:224): ‘[A]n die Stelle der neutralen Einordnung eines Ereignisses [tritt] sein erwartetes Eintreffen. Während ... auf neutrale Weise die zeitliche Einordnung von Ereignissen präsentiert, betont מועד die Dynamik, mit der das angekündigte Ereignis näher rückt.’

The term קץ has already appeared in Daniel 11:6 and 13, and appears seven more times in Daniel 11-12 (at 11:35, 40, 45 and 12:4, 6, 9, 13). At 11:6 and 13 the word occurs in conjunction with שנים (v 6, לְקֹץ שָׁנִים; v 13, וּלְקֹץ הַיָּמִים שָׁנִים) and thus indicates the end of a limited period of time in a particular king’s reign. However, in 11:27, 35, 40 and in 12:4, 6, 9, 13 the term refers not to the end of a time period in the king’s reign, but seems to have definite eschatological overtones, especially where it appears as the phrase עֲדֵי־עַתְּ קֹץ and in conjunction with מועד (cf. also Wildgruber 2013:224). Wildgruber (2013:224) observes: ‘Die begrenzten Zeiträume der Ereignisse vor diesem letzten König, die ebenfalls mit Hilfe des Begriffs קֹץ beschrieben werden (V. 6a. 13c), nehmen gleichsam das absolute Ende vorweg und verweisen darauf.’ Collins (1974a:26) on the other hand disagrees with this notion. He believes that in Daniel the word never designates ‘the “end” of anything in particular and seems to refer to “a time of crisis” rather than to a definite end’ (Collins 1974a:26), but in my opinion this is not tenable in the contexts where the word occurs.

At 9:26 above, in a discussion on the word קץ, I suggested that the whole expression קֹץ לְמוֹעֵד פִּי־עוֹד points to more than simply the end of Antiochus’ reign. This is because of the combination of מועד (appointed time) and קץ (end), as well as the fact that

‘end’ is indefinite.²⁵² Koch²⁵³ (1997:172) surmises that in Daniel 11:27, 29 and 35 מוֹעֵד ‘is probably not intended to be understood in an eschatological sense,’ but I beg to differ, at least for 11:27 and 35 where both מוֹעֵד and קֶץ appear together, which in my opinion does point not just to the immediate future, but also the eschatological future. Lucas (2002:268) rightly suggests an echo of Habakkuk 2:3a:²⁵⁴ ‘For the vision is yet for the appointed time, it pants towards the end, and it will not lie (i.e. prove false)’ (my translation; כִּי עוֹד קְוֹן וְלֹא יִכְזֵב (לְמוֹעֵד וְיִפְתָּה לְקֶץ וְלֹא יִכְזֵב)). It is interesting that in Habakkuk both מוֹעֵד and קֶץ appear with the definite article, whereas in the present context, the last word is indefinite. This leads me to suspect that this is a reference not merely to the immediate future, but also to some indefinite eschatological end. The expression לְמוֹעֵד מוֹעֵדִים וְחָצִי in Daniel 12:7 will be discussed when this verse is explained below.

2.4.3.5.4 General Measures against Jewish Religion (11:28)

The negotiations with the King of the South having failed (Dn 11:27), the text tells us that the King of the North will return to his own country ‘with much plunder,’ but in such an evil mood that he will set his heart ‘against the holy covenant’ (this expression will be discussed below at verses 29-30) and take action, presumably against it, on the way (v 28, NASB). What exactly is entailed in this ‘taking action’ against ‘the holy covenant’ is not explained in verse 28.

The historical facts are that Antiochus had to leave Egypt, though he did establish a garrison at the border (at Pelusium; Lucas 2002:285), and returned ‘to his own land with much plunder/possessions’ (Dn 11:28, my translation). According to 1 Maccabees 1:20-28, it was at this stage that Antiochus sacked the temple in Jerusalem and plundered its

²⁵² Wildgruber’s (2013:219ff) discussion on the semantic field ‘time’ is worthwhile noting. In Daniel 11 the words that belong to this field are: קֶץ (end), שָׁנָה (year), עֵת (time, point in time), יוֹם (day), מוֹעֵד (appointed time), and עוֹלָם (eternity, distant time, duration) as well as עַד (eternity, undefined future) (Wildgruber 2013:219). These terms are subdivided into expressions of time that are definite, concrete and of limited duration, such as שָׁנָה and יוֹם; expressions of time that point to a definite but not exactly defined point in time, e.g. עֵת and מוֹעֵד; expressions of time that are of limited, but not exactly defined duration, such as קֶץ; and the opposite of this, i.e. expressions of time that are neither definite nor of limited duration, such as עוֹלָם and עַד (Wildgruber 2013:219). Later on she notes that the time references do not coincide with the references to the kings and that the ‘days of the rulers are integrated into this independent system [of time references] and thus counted [and limited]’ (Wildgruber 2013:222; my translation).

²⁵³ Koch (1997:170) notes that most of the occurrences of the word מוֹעֵד that refer to time are in connection with the three major Jewish festivals, Passover, Weeks and Tabernacles, though the word is also often used together with reference to the monthly new-moon festival and even the weekly Sabbath. Furthermore, these ‘appointed times’ represent those days when God approaches Israel as the Creator and meets with his cultic community’ (Koch 1997:170). But מוֹעֵד can also refer to new ‘appointed times’ ‘for good fortune or disaster for human beings in history’ (Koch 1997:172). As such the word refers to the plague in the time of David (2 Sm 24:15), the fifth plague on Egypt (Ex 9:5) and in particular the destruction of Jerusalem (Lam 1:4, 15; 2:6f; 22). Koch (1997:172) remarks that the ‘development of eschatological notions from a cultic context can be discerned here [i.e. Lamentations] in an exemplary fashion.’ Similarly, ‘Yahweh appoints significant times in the history of other peoples,’ in particular the ‘Hellenistic Diadochian kings’ in Daniel 11:27, 29 and 35 (Koch 1997:172).

²⁵⁴ So also Collins (1990:95).

treasures. In 2 Maccabees 5, however, the sacking of the temple is said to have taken place after his second campaign against Egypt a year or so later, in order to put down an insurrection (perhaps it is this reaction to the insurrection that the words ‘and he will take action,’ וְעָשָׂה, lit. ‘he will do,’²⁵⁵ in Daniel 11:28c refer).

2.4.3.5.5 War with the King of the South – Failure Due to the Intervention of the ‘Kittim’ (11:29-30)

The two Ptolemies had meanwhile made peace and ruled Egypt together, and when Antiochus tried to invade Egypt again (168 BCE), they put up ‘a united front’ (Longman 1999:279). In addition, Rome also intervened, and Antiochus had to leave by order of the Roman Senate. Daniel 11:29-30a seems to refer to this incident, though in rather veiled terms: ‘At the appointed²⁵⁶ time (לְמוֹעֵד) he will return and will enter into the south, but it will not be as at first or as afterwards. Ships of Kittim²⁵⁷ will come against him, and he will be cowed and he will return’ (my translation). Antiochus actually withdrew to return to Syria – again via Judea. Daniel 11:28b says that ‘his heart was (directed) against a holy covenant’ (וּלְרָבוֹ עַל-בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ), and verse 30b notes that ‘he will be indignant against a holy covenant and take action and he will turn and give attention to/give heed to/consider (the opinion of?) those who forsake a holy covenant’ (my translation; וּבָאוּ בָּו צַיִים כְּתִימִם וְנִכְאָה וְשָׁב וְנָתַן עַל-עֲזָבֵי בְרִית קֹדֶשׁ וְנָתַן עַל-בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ וְעָשָׂה וְשָׁב וְנָתַן עַל-עֲזָבֵי בְרִית קֹדֶשׁ). In other words, the ‘holy covenant’ is threatened both from the outside by a pagan king who acts destructively against it (Dn 11:28, 30) and from the inside by those who initially belonged to it, but now ‘forsake’ it and ‘act wickedly against’ it (Dn 11:30, 32; Wildgruber 2013:214). Wildgruber (2013:213-214) rightly observes that in each case the expression בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ is introduced with the preposition עַל and stands at the end of the clause, thus drawing the attention of the reader to it. This also applies to the compound expression עַל-עֲזָבֵי בְרִית קֹדֶשׁ.

²⁵⁵ Some scholars suggest that וְעָשָׂה is a misreading of וַיַּעֲבֹד for the purported Aramaic original וַיַּעֲבֹר, ‘as he passes through’ (e.g. Hartman & DiLella 1978:270; so also at 11:30 and 39). It is suggested that at 11:10 and 40 the translator has read correctly וַיַּעֲבֹר ‘because of the implicit quotation from Isa 8:8 in these verses’ (Hartman & DiLella 1978:270). However, this is pure conjecture, and though the text is not easy, it is not incomprehensible, hence the MT should be retained.

²⁵⁶ Lucas (2002:285) rightly observes that this phrase is ‘a reminder that Antiochus’ career is within the control of God.’

²⁵⁷ Steinmann (2008:529) and others (e.g. Lucas 2002:286) point to the fact that this is an echo or a deliberate allusion to Numbers 24:24, the first of only four occurrences in the HB of the word צַיִ for ‘ship’ (the other three being Dn 11:30, Is 33:21 and Ezk 30:9). Numbers 24:24 comes in the course of Balaam’s last prophecy that is often considered to be ultimately messianic (Nu 24:15-24; e.g. Wenham 1981:178-179; Brown 2002:222; Steinmann 2008:529). The last few verses in this prophecy are prophecies against the nations that would attack Israel, and the general thrust is that all of Israel’s enemies will be destroyed. The last of these prophecies is against Asshur and Eber. The text reads (Nu 24:23b-24, NASB): ‘Alas, who can live except God has ordained it? But ships shall come from the coast of Kittim, And they shall afflict Asshur and will afflict Eber; So they also will come to destruction.’ Lucas (2002:286) suggests that in Daniel 11 ‘there is an element in this section of applying to Antiochus references to Assyria,’ as evidenced by the allusion to Isaiah 10:22-23 and 28:15-22 in Daniel 11:22a (see above) and here.

The designation ‘holy covenant’ occurs only in these verses (i.e. Dn 11:28, 30) in the HB.²⁵⁸ The precise meaning of the phrase has been debated. There are basically four interpretations (cf. van der Kooij 1993:497-498), though one or two others (see below) could be added. The most common view is that it designates either the Jewish nation in general (e.g. Miller 1994:301; Stahl 1994:192 ‘Gemeinschaft von Juda’; Seow 2003:179) or more specifically the community of faithful law-abiding Jews (cf. Montgomery 1927:451; Baldwin 1978:195; Goldingay 1991:301, ‘covenant people’).²⁵⁹ Goldingay (1991:301) suggests that the expression is reminiscent of the phrase ‘holy ones’ (קְדִישֵׁי) (עֲלִינוּנִי) in Daniel 7:27. He also points to the expressions ‘holy people’ (עַם-קֹדֶשׁ) in Daniel 12:7 and ‘covenant prince’ (נְגִיד בְּרִית) in Daniel 11:22, and explains that these ‘covenant people’ are ‘the people who are endowed with a covenant relationship with God’ (Goldingay 1991:301). Baldwin (1978:193) agrees with this view, but with an important addition. She notes that the phrase ‘against the holy covenant’ means that ‘animosity against the Jews will break out again, but by using this phraseology “holy covenant” more than that is implied, for it took two to make a covenant, and God’s initiation of it made any opponent anti-God.’ She goes on to argue that the enemy of the Jews in verse 28 does not just fight the Jews, but ‘will be taking on God Himself’ (Baldwin 1978:193).

It was this view that I preferred in my Master’s thesis (Linington 2003b). I had argued there that due to the symbolic nature of the prophecy one should not focus the interpretation too narrowly on just the situation in the second century BCE, but allow for applications to human oppressors generally. I suggested that in that case ‘the term בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ will refer to those people who remain true to God’ (Linington 2003b:78). I continued to argue that if בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ indeed refers to people, the usage is similar to that in Isaiah 42:6 and 49:8. There, the phrase עַם בְּרִית appears, incidentally also a connection made by Montgomery (1927:451), though in his comments on Daniel 11:22. I had argued earlier elsewhere (Linington 2003a:264) that in Isaiah 42 and 49 a person is or becomes a בְּרִית ‘by what he *does*.’ The same could be argued in the context of Daniel 11:28 and 30ff, since in Daniel 11:32-35 we are told that there are some in the nation who do not give in to the wicked king’s policies, but who ‘display strength and take action’ since they are ‘people who know their God’ (Dn 11:32; וְעַם יִדְעֵי אֱלֹהֵיהֶם יִתְזַקְרוּ וְעָשׂוּ). Their action consists in giving ‘understanding to many,’ presumably teaching them God’s covenant law (Dn 11:33). So, if one argues that it is these people who are meant by בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ, the epithet קֹדֶשׁ is an important ‘marker, since it means “apartness, sacredness” (BDB, p. 871), in other words,

²⁵⁸ Wildgruber (2013:214, n. 80) observes that a possible variant of the term occurs in 1 Maccabees 1:15, 63 where the phrase *διαθήκη ἁγία* appears, which in Theodotion translates the phrase בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ.

²⁵⁹ Montgomery (1927:451) for example notes (on Dn 11:22) that covenant ‘is used almost concretely, as of the Covenant Church.’

the people belonging to the *בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ* have set themselves apart for the service of God alone. That is why they suffer persecution from the “King of the North” (Linington 2003b:78). I continued to contend that the qualifier ‘holy’ was used ‘to differentiate [this covenant] from all the other, secular covenants that are alluded to in the chapter. This would also explain the expression ‘prince of the covenant’ (v 22) because, whoever is meant, it is a human being with whom the covenant is concluded, while the *בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ* refers to the covenant relationship between Yahweh and Israel’ (Linington 2003b:78). This argument did, however, leave the use of *בְּרִית* without any qualifier in verse 32 unaccounted for.

A second view concerning the meaning of the phrase ‘holy covenant’ has been propounded by older scholars such as Charles (n.d.:130). Charles (n.d.:130) believes that it means ‘the religion of Israel’ or ‘the practice of religion’ (Charles n.d.:109). Barnes (1834: on Dn 11:28) says that ‘The words “holy covenant” are a technical expression to denote the Jewish institutions.’ Keil & Delitzsch (1996:798) likewise state that ‘*בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ* signifies not the holy people in covenant with God ..., but the divine institution of the Old Covenant, the Jewish Theocracy. The Jews are only members of this covenant.’ Millar (1978), a more modern scholar, in his evaluation of Hengel’s book ‘Judaism and Hellenism’ (see below) does not explicitly comment on the phrase ‘holy covenant.’ However, he asserts that contra Hengel’s thesis there is little if any evidence for a pro-Hellenistic party in Jewish circles in the 3rd and 2nd centuries BCE. Jewish Hellenism at that time was quite superficial, and ‘the crisis of the 160’s arose from an attempt by Antiochus Epiphanes to impose by force the abolition of Judaism and the adoption of paganism’ (Millar 1978:21). This seems to imply that Millar would agree with the view that the ‘holy covenant’ against whom Antiochus was raging was in fact the *system* of the Jewish religion. There is of course some truth in this. Antiochus did indeed abolish Jewish customs and try to force the nation to adopt pagan customs, but on top of that he also tried to eliminate all those people who did not follow his directives in this regard. Thus a notion of the ‘holy covenant’ only encompassing the religious system without the people adhering to it is too narrow. Redditt (1999:183-184) argues that ‘[t]he “covenant” here is the ‘Sinai covenant in particular, but it would include all of Scripture and the practices of Judaism as understood by the author of Daniel 11.’ In other words, he combines this second view with the following third view.

Related to this second view is that of Hengel who appears to equate the ‘holy covenant’ with the Mosaic law (Hengel 1974:305; cf. van der Kooij 1993:498).²⁶⁰ Hengel (1974:305) says that ‘Jewish renegades wanted to reverse by violence the course which the Jewish people had pursued since the exile’ but the faithful Jews ‘did not refer one-sidedly to the Torah but used a ‘more comprehensive term from salvation history: they defended “the holy covenant”.’ He continues:²⁶¹ ‘Among the fathers of Jewish apocalyptic there was still a lively awareness that the history of God with his people rested on a “covenant” the most important part of which was, of course, the law’ (Hengel 1974:305). Hengel (1974:305) goes on to say that the attack of the apostates on the law ‘aroused a corresponding counter-reaction, “zeal for the law”’ (Hengel 1974:305). However, the opinion that the expression ‘holy covenant’ in Daniel 11 refers to the ‘law’ (i.e. the Torah) has rightly been criticized.

Lebram (1970:512) for example denies the accuracy of Hengel’s position. He argues that the term *בְּרִית* in Daniel cannot refer to the law, but must denote ‘the carrying out of God’s established cult by the legitimate priesthood’²⁶² (literal translation; Lebram 1970:512). He argues that ‘those who forsake the holy covenant’ in verse 30 are persons who go against the established cult (Lebram 1970:512; cf. van der Kooij 1993:500), while the expression *נְגִיד בְּרִית* in verse 22 is a reference to the High Priest (Lebram 1970:512; he does not name him). Van der Kooij (1993:498f) agrees with Lebram and gives a more detailed treatment of this position. In his opinion, the expression *בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ* in Daniel 11:28, 30 ‘refers to actions by Antiochus IV against the *temple* of Jerusalem’ (his emphasis), a view substantiated by the fact that in verse 22 the reference to the ‘prince of the covenant’ is to the High Priest (Van der Kooij 1993:498). Moreover, since *קֹדֶשׁ* can mean either holiness or sanctuary, the phrase *בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ* could be translated either ‘covenant of holiness’ or ‘covenant concerning the holy place’ (van der Kooij 1993:498). Thirdly, van der Kooij (1993:499) does not believe that in the context of Daniel 11:28, 30 *בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ* could refer to ‘the holy way of life according to the law,’ especially since in his opinion the reference is ‘not ... to actions against the Jewish religion in general, but against the temple of Jerusalem in particular’ (van der Kooij 1993:499). Fourthly, he observes that in the LXX the two possibilities of translating the phrase *בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ* (i.e. as ‘covenant of holiness’ – Th, *διαθήκην ἁγίαν* – or ‘covenant concerning the holy place’ – OG, *διαθήκην τοῦ ἁγίου*) are

²⁶⁰ Apparently this view was already voiced by Theodoret (Commentary on Dn 11:28 in Stevenson & Glerup 2008:293): ““And his heart will be against the holy covenant.” At last, he will have one endeavour, namely, to destroy *the law* given by God to the Jews’ (italics added).

²⁶¹ The German original (Hengel 1973:557) reads: ‘Bei den Vätern der jüdischen Apokalyptik war das Bewußtsein noch unmittelbar lebendig, daß die Geschichte Gottes mit seinem Volk auf einem “Bundesschluß” beruhe, dessen wichtigsten Bestandteil freilich das Gesetz bildete.’

²⁶² The original reads: ‘den Vollzug des von Gott gestifteten Kultus durch das legitimierte Priestergeschlecht’ (Lebram 1970:512).

actually mentioned (van der Kooij 1993:499). Thus van der Kooij (1993:499) suggests that ‘the notion of covenant in Dan 11,28.30 is related to the temple.’ Van der Kooij (1993:499) goes on to argue that in the present text a reference to the cult and the temple is to be understood in the light of the covenant with Phinehas (Nu 25) who was given a ‘covenant of eternal priesthood’ (ברית כהנת עולם) because of his faithfulness (cf. 1 Macc 2:54). Sixthly, van der Kooij (1993:500) consequently understands the phrase ברית קדש as ‘the ordinance concerning the sanctuary, both with respect to its rituals (sacrifices) and its holy objects.’ Though the covenant is ‘about priestly duties’ one may, in his opinion, derive from this the notion that “‘the covenant concerning the sanctuary’” refers to the temple cult,’ especially in view of the allusion in Daniel 11:28, 30 to Antiochus’ attacks against the temple (van der Kooij 1993:500). Lastly, the people who ‘abandon the holy covenant’ in verse 30 ‘refers to persons who no longer do what they should do in the temple,’ or to ‘renegade priests’ (Lebram (1970:513; cf. van der Kooij 1993:500). Since this also fits very well with the notion that the ‘prince of the covenant’ in Daniel 11:22 is the high priest, i.e. the ‘head of the temple and its cult,’ van der Kooij (1993:500) draws a parallel to Nehemiah 11:11 where the phrase בית האלהים (in נגד בית האלהים) replaces ברית (in נגיד ברית) in Daniel 11:22.

Looking at these different arguments concerning the meaning of the phrase ברית קדש and the context of Daniel 11, it seems that one should perhaps not choose between them, but consider them as a whole. Maybe this is the reason why the expression is indefinite (i.e. בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ, not בְּרִית הַקֹּדֶשׁ). If it was definite, it would almost certainly indicate the sanctuary, but being indefinite, ‘covenant of holiness/separation’ can refer to either things (‘covenant of sanctuary/holy things’) or people (‘covenant of holy people’).²⁶³ As noted above, קֹדֶשׁ means ‘apartness, sacredness’ (BDB) or (the adjective) ‘holy: of things: awe-inspiring, to be treated w. caution, kept fm. profane use; ... holy: of persons’ (HALOT). It is also a term used by Isaiah of God (‘the Holy One of Israel;’ Is 1:4 etc.) and by Zechariah for angelic beings (Zech 14:5). Thus ‘holy’ has to do with something set apart for God, for his special use and purpose, which is true for the people of God as well as for God’s Law, the priesthood, and the observance of such institutions as temple service etc. If a בְּרִית is described as holy, therefore, it also is set apart for God, for his special use and purpose. As the different interpretations show, the context of Daniel 11 allows for seeing this as either people or things, including the temple.

²⁶³ Wildgruber (2013:215) notes: ‘Eine Entscheidung, welcher der Vorschläge zutreffend ist, kann auf der Ebene des Textes nicht getroffen werden, so dass die Formulierung notwendigerweise andeutend bleibt.’

Another question to be asked (but not always answered by interpreters) is *why* the King of the North is ‘*against* the holy covenant’ (Dn 11:28) and ‘*enraged at* the holy covenant’ (Dn 11:30). The context speaks of the wars he waged against the King of the South, but says nothing about other events. Why now his hostility against the ‘holy covenant’? Miller (1994:301) suggests that ‘Antiochus turned his humiliation [by the Romans] into anger against the Jewish people (“the holy covenant”),’ but is that really all there is to it? Though it often happens that when someone is humiliated they will turn their frustration against those weaker than themselves, knowing that they cannot do so against the actual people who humiliated them in the first place, there is something irrational about this enmity here. It is reminiscent of Haman’s hatred of the Jews in the book of Esther. By attacking the people of God, this despicable ruler also attacks God himself (cf. Baldwin 1978:193) and everything he stands for, but in doing so he ultimately signs his own death warrant.

Buchanan (1999:343-346) suggests a different version of events from that normally advocated. He believes that Antiochus had perhaps made a treaty (this is how Buchanan translates ברית throughout) with the Jews in Jerusalem. However, orthodox Jews were not in favour of it, or if they agreed with it at the beginning, they later broke it. Perhaps they were even supporting the Egyptians by sending their own envoys to Rome complaining about Antiochus’ invasion of that land. As a result, when forced by the Romans to give up the campaign, Antiochus returned through Judah to punish those who failed to keep faith with him while rewarding those who were in favour of it. This included a rigorous policy of putting in place his Hellenizing policies (Buchanan 1999:345). His ‘indignation’ or ‘rage’ with those who kept the holy covenant was shown in his ruthless persecution of anybody who resisted these, which included positively the building of a garrison and a gymnasium in Jerusalem (1 Macc 1:14) and negatively the prohibition of Jewish customs and festivals such as circumcision, Sabbath and other feast days, sacrifices as well as possession of the Jewish scriptures (cf. 1 Macc 1:41-51, 56-57). Anyone not conforming was put to death (1 Macc 1:50, 60-63). Daniel 11:31 points out how this man and his followers even desecrated the Temple by abolishing the normal daily (morning and evening) sacrifices and by setting up ‘the abomination of desolation’ (וַיִּתְּנוּ הַשְּׂקִיז מְשׁוּמָה). According to 1 Maccabees 1:54, Antiochus built an altar dedicated to Zeus on top of the altar of burnt offering and offered sacrifices there (and elsewhere at altars built in Jerusalem), whereas 2 Maccabees 6:5 notes that ‘The altar of sacrifice was loaded with victims proscribed by the law as profane’ (NJB).

2.4.3.5.6 Measures against Religion in General (11:31-38)

2.4.3.5.6.1 Measures against Jewish Religion – Severe Persecution (11:31)

Daniel 11:31 reports how part of the measures against (Jewish) religion included the desecration, at the hands of ‘forces arising (וְעֹמְדוֹ) from him (מִמֶּנּוּ),²⁶⁴ of ‘the sanctuary, the mountain fortress’ (וְהַקְּדִישׁ הַמְּקֻדָּשׁ הַמְּעוֹז), the removal of the regular sacrifice(s) (וְהַסִּירוּ הַתְּמִיד) and the institution in place of these of the ‘abomination that causes desolation’ (וְנִתְּנָה הַשִּׁקּוּץ (מְשׁוּמָּה). All this cannot have taken place without the use of force. Here is the king’s ultimate hubris, rising up not just against human beings, but God himself. Miller (1994:301) suggests that the description of the Temple as a ‘mountain fortress’ may imply that it was in fact used as a military citadel. Lebram (1984:120) observes that the words ‘sanctuary’ and ‘mountain fortress’ are not combined through a conjunction (i.e. they are in apposition, Steinmann 2008:517²⁶⁵). He therefore thinks that it is possible that the ‘mountain fortress’ designated a place beside the Temple, i.e. the Akra where the Greek soldiers performed their own cult (Lebram 1984:120). I think this is less likely, but in either case, the temple was desecrated as far as the Jews were concerned.²⁶⁶

During Antiochus’ reign, the desecration of the temple included plundering its treasures, an activity engaged in not only by Antiochus Epiphanes, but other Seleucid leaders before him (cf. Buchanan 1999:348, n. 45). Buchanan (1999:348) explains that since Epiphanes means ‘manifest deity,’ Antiochus probably thought it was within his rights as such to enter temples and take whatever treasures they held. The Jerusalem temple was just one of those he plundered during his time in office (Buchanan 1999:348).

²⁶⁴ Buchanan (1999:346) offers an alternative translation of וְעֹמְדוֹ הַמְּקֻדָּשׁ הַמְּעוֹז: Instead of ‘And forces from him will arise and they will desecrate the sanctuary, the mountain fortress’ (my translation, but cf. NASB), he has ‘Then the powerful ones among us will rise up and plunder the temple and the mountain fortress.’ There are, however, problems with this suggestion. According to HALOT, the word עֹמֵד can mean ‘power,’ or even ‘violence,’ so Buchanan’s suggestion is not without foundation. However, in Daniel 11:15 and 22 the expression עֹמֵד (v. 22 it is עֹמֵד; literally ‘arms, forearms,’ but metaphorically ‘activity of power,’ ‘help,’ ‘God’s arm,’ i.e. power, ‘military forces,’ cf. HALOT) definitely means (military) forces, and I believe that this would be the more natural translation here too. Buchanan (1999:348) cannot explain ‘who these powerful ones were.’ The preposition מִמֶּנּוּ is admittedly ambiguous, since it could mean either ‘from him’ or ‘from us,’ depending on the context. Buchanan (1999:348) comments: ‘It could mean that the troops that were from Antiochus were the ones who acted, or it could mean the forces of the Jewish nation who supported Antiochus were themselves the ones who actually committed these acts, which were offensive to orthodox Jews.’ He goes on to note that Antiochus ‘gave instructions for those who had abandoned the holy contract’ (his translation of verse 30b). His translation would imply a quotation from those apostates in the present text, which in my opinion is unlikely. Hence I prefer the translation offered by the majority of texts. While the desecration of the temple certainly included plundering its treasures, there is according to HALOT and BDB no precedence for translating וְעֹמְדוֹ as ‘they plundered;’ rather, the word means ‘defile, profane.’

²⁶⁵ Steinmann (2008:517) suggests that the two nouns form a hendiadys, meaning ‘the temple fortress,’ cf. NASB etc. He says that it ‘refers to a fortress erected on the temple mount.’ Lebram (1984:120) proposes the translation ‘the sanctuary, namely the mountain fortress.’

²⁶⁶ Gowan (2001:150) believes that after the sacking of Jerusalem Antiochus left troops in the city, which led to ‘continued unrest,’ which might explain the extent of the religious persecution described in this and the following verses.

The removal of the regular sacrifices and the setting up of the *הַשְׁקוּי מִשׁוֹמְמִים* would have been the ultimate insult to orthodox religious feelings and obviously rendered the temple unclean for the use of the Jews. The text itself does not give any more details about the nature of the desecration. Lebram (1984:120) suggests that the *הַשְׁקוּי מִשׁוֹמְמִים*²⁶⁷ was a pagan cult figure, connected to the Syrian god Belshamin, and that the Hebrew title ‘war eine herabsetzende Imitation dieses Namens, der auf der lautlichen Ähnlichkeit beider Namen beruht.’ Buchanan (1999:349) similarly notes that according to Rabbinic tradition ‘the abomination of desolation was a statue ... that was set up in the temple,’ whereas 1 Maccabees 1:54 says it was set up on the altar. Buchanan (1999:349) surmises that it might have been a statue of Zeus (so also Steinmann 2008:530). The desecration consisted of pagan sacrifices, including pigs and other unclean animals, which were offered both in the Jerusalem temple and on altars set up elsewhere in the land (cf. Lucas 2002:286), and a ban on other Jewish religious practices such as circumcision ‘on pain of death’ (Lucas 2002:286).

2.4.3.5.6.1.1 The Fate of Faithful Jews versus that of Apostates during the Time of Persecution (11:32-35)

During this time of intense persecution, many Jews forsook the ‘holy covenant’ and agreed with Antiochus’ policies. Antiochus apparently listened to their advice²⁶⁸ (or at least paid attention to them, *וַיִּבְּחוּ עַל-עֲזָבֵי בְרִית קֹדֶשׁ*, Daniel 11:30). They are labelled ‘those who act wickedly against/violators of [the] covenant,’ *וַיִּמְרְשׁוּ עֵי בְרִית*, in Daniel 11:32a, and ‘apostates’ in 1 Macc 1:52 (NJB, lit. ‘those who forsake the law,’ *παῖς ὁ ἐγκαταλείπων τὸν νόμον*,²⁶⁹ cf. Dn 11:30), men who are ‘polluted’ (BDB) or ‘defiled, brought to apostasy’ (HALOT)²⁷⁰ by Antiochus’ ‘smooth words’ (*יִתְגַּדְּלוּ בְּחַלְקוֹת*) and who turn against their own countrymen.²⁷¹ Steinmann (2008:530) suggests that the expression here ‘refers to the high priest Menelaus and his followers who readily acquiesced to the abominable policies

²⁶⁷ Steinmann (2008:517) connects the *הַשְׁקוּי מִשׁוֹמְמִים* of the present verse to Daniel 8:13 (*וְהַפְּשַׁע שָׁמַיִם*), ‘the transgression causing desolation’) whose construction with definite noun and indefinite participle is similar, as is Daniel 9:27 (*וְעַל* (‘upon the wing of detested things (is) a desolator’).

²⁶⁸ Cf. Collins 1993:284, who argues that the brief reference to the Jewish renegades here ‘suggests that Antiochus’s subsequent actions were taken on their advice.’

²⁶⁹ The same verb is used in the LXX (OG) of Daniel 11:30 for ‘those who forsake the holy covenant,’ *ἐγκατέλιπον τὴν διαθήκην τοῦ ἁγίου*.

²⁷⁰ The verb *הִנִּיחַ* only occurs 11 times in the MT and always refers to pollution of the land or even the prophets and priests through the sin (esp., but not exclusively, murder, immorality and idolatry) of the people. Thus it is a fitting term in this context. Particularly relevant is Isaiah 24:5 in this regard, because there, like here, both *הִנִּיחַ* and *בְּרִית* occur together: *וְהָאֲרֶץ מְגֻזָּה תַּחַת יְשָׁעֶיהָ כִּי-עֲבָרוּ תוֹרַת חֻלְפוֹ הִנִּיחוּ חֹק הַפָּרוּ בְרִית עוֹלָם: (And the land/earth is polluted by (lit. under) its inhabitants, for they have transgressed the laws, violated the statute, broken the eternal covenant; my translation, but cf. NASB). Though *בְּרִית* does not appear in Jeremiah 3:1, 2, 9 and Psalm 108:38, in the context there the prophet or psalmist also accuses the Israelites of polluting the land with their wickedness, i.e. covenant unfaithfulness.*

²⁷¹ The expression *מִרְשָׁעֵי בְרִית* occurs in exactly the same form in 1QM 1:2, a text that is obviously based on these verses in Daniel 11. The occurrence there will be discussed in the section on 1QM.

imposed by Antiochus.’ מרשיעי is the Hiphil mp participle construct of רָשַׁע, ‘become guilty’ (HALOT) or ‘be wicked, act wickedly ... be guilty’ (BDB). In this form, it only appears here in the MT.²⁷² In the context of Daniel 11, ‘*rāšā*’ refers first to the person who threatens the life of a compatriot’ (Van Leeuwen 1997:1262) and otherwise commits atrocities against his own people. In addition, the *rš* ‘ can also be one who commits apostasy (cf. Ps 58:4), a meaning that fits the present context in Daniel too. These are, then, wicked people, apostates, renegade Jews who collaborate with the pagan invaders against their fellow countrymen. The covenant here is obviously the Mosaic covenant.

Daniel 11:32 says about the מרשיעי ברית that they are easily ‘deceived’ by the King of the North into ‘godlessness’, i.e. apostasy (NASB; וּמְרַשְׁעֵי בְרִית יְהוָה בְּחִלְקוֹת) or disloyalty to their God (cf. Slotki 1951:97). The word חָנַף, translated ‘turn to godlessness’ by NASB, is literally ‘to pollute’ (see note 269). Knierim (1997:447-448) observes that ‘[t]he meaning “to be perverted” (hi. “to pervert”) is recognizable in all occurrences of the verb (Dan. 11:32, seduction to apostasy...).’ This verb goes well with the nominative מרשיעי as noted above.

In contrast to these מרשיעי ברית who are easily led astray into apostasy are those who refuse to do so and rather suffer death than forsake their religion (1 Macc 1:62-63). Daniel 11:32b calls them ‘people who know their God’ (עַם יֹדְעֵי אֱלֹהֵיו) who ‘will (cause to) be strong and take action’ (וְעַם יֹדְעֵי אֱלֹהֵיו יִחְזְקוּ וְעָשׂוּ); 1 Maccabees 1:53 calls them ‘Israel,’ in distinction from the apostates – the ‘remnant,’ as Paul might say (Ro 11:5; cf. 9:6-12). The מרשיעי ברית are contrasted with the עַם יֹדְעֵי אֱלֹהֵיו, and יְחַנְיָה is contrasted with יִחְזְקוּ וְעָשׂוּ in this verse. The wicked are easily deceived, turned to apostasy, whereas the ‘people who know their God’ are steadfast, ‘strong’ or even ‘causing (others) to be strong’ and willing and able to ‘act’ for their faith. They have ‘insight’ (וּמִשְׁכִּילֵי עַם, Dn 11:33a) and ‘understanding’ (cf. HALOT; or are ‘prudent,’ BDB) and pass this ‘insight’ or ‘understanding’ on to cause ‘many’ others who are likeminded ‘to understand’ (וְיָבִינוּ לְרַבִּים, Daniel 11:33a).²⁷³ The description of the עַם יֹדְעֵי אֱלֹהֵיו as standing firm and acting could, but need not, imply ‘an endorsement of the Maccabean revolt’ (Collins 1993:385). Collins (1993:385) rightly observes that ‘Daniel never refers unambiguously to the armed struggle [of the Maccabees], and it is clear that the action he most values is that of the *maskîlîm*, described in the following verses.’ Goldingay (1991:303) remarks that the word בֵּין in this verse ‘suggests that the ministry of the discerning is not teaching in general or exhortation

²⁷² Van Leeuwen (1997:1262) observes that ‘[t]he root *rš*’ appears in the OT as the most important antonym of *šdq*....

In contrast to the positive root *šdq*, *rš*’ expresses negative behavior – evil thoughts, words, and deeds – antisocial behavior that simultaneously betrays a person’s inner disharmony and unrest.’

²⁷³ Collins (1993:385) argues that עַם יֹדְעֵי אֱלֹהֵיו ‘is a general designation for the Jewish resistance’ and ‘broader than the [expression] עַם מִשְׁכִּילֵי ... of the following verse.’

to faithfulness but the interpretation of the prophetic scriptures – and no doubt of these Danielic visions – for the persecuted community.’ He adds that the word רַבִּים indicates that it was no small body of people, but probably the majority of the Jews who resisted the religious policies of Antiochus which were only accepted by ‘the Tobiads and the Hellenising community’ (Goldingay 1991:303).

The verb שָׁכַל has been discussed above at Daniel 9:13. In the present verse it appears in the form מְשַׁכְּלִי, the Hiphil mp construct participle, and is used as a noun modifying the absolute term עַם. The meaning that fits the context best is that of having insight, but the idea of ‘thinking through ... resulting in wise dealing’ (Goldberg 1999:877) is, I believe, also included.²⁷⁴ Sæbø (1997:1271) and Porteous (1965:168) both believe that in the present text the מְשַׁכְּלִים are a special class of people, and Porteous (Porteous 1965:168) prefers to translate עַם מְשַׁכְּלִי more narrowly than the literal ‘the insightful of the people’ “the wise *leaders* of the people,” meaning those who came forward in the crisis and paid, many of them with their lives, for their courage and loyalty’ (italics added). Slotki (1951:97) also notes that these מְשַׁכְּלִים are ‘spiritual leaders, who in that time of severe trial, adhered to the right, though perilous, course.’²⁷⁵ But it is doubtful if only leaders are meant here. Steinmann (2008:531) rightly suggests that ‘those who “have insight” are those who have faith in and are faithful to God, who study and understand his Word, and who rely upon it to respond to the challenges they face in living committed lives of faith in his promises, even when persecuted to the point of death.’ In other words, though there are leaders among this group, not all of them are necessarily leaders, but they are all wholeheartedly committed to the truth of God’s word and willing to suffer for it. In the context I believe that this is to be preferred, since they are contrasted with the wicked who fall away, and likewise not all the wicked were leaders, though many were. Later, in the Qumran literature, the term מְשַׁכְּלִי took on a special meaning since there he is an important leader in the community who ‘imparts enlightenment and understanding, in accordance with [the] biblical usage of the word’ (Anderson 1984:139).

²⁷⁴ Freyne (1982:9) proposes that ‘[b]y using the designation [i.e. מְשַׁכְּלִי] the author wishes to suggest that Daniel is the maskil, par excellence’ (cf. also Collins 1975:603, who states that Daniel ‘is the paradigm for the “wise” of Dan. xi 32-33’). Furthermore, it appears that ‘Daniel is intended as typical of the group as a whole, both in his lifestyle and in the consequences that accrue to him as a result of his superior knowledge of God’s plan for the end of days.’ Sæbø (1997:1270) notes that מְשַׁכְּלִי means to be ‘insightful, intelligent, clever,’ and that this form often contrasts with the ‘fool’ and the ‘wicked’ (‘transgressor’, רָשָׁע). The מְשַׁכְּלִי not only exhibits intelligence, but is also religious (in the sense of God-fearing) and in Daniel the word can refer to a special class of trained people (cf. Dn 1:4, 17; Sæbø 1997:1270). Daniel 1:4 and 17, however, do not use the participle in the sense of a particular class of people. Daniel 1:4 states that the king of Babylon was looking among his captives for young men ‘understanding/having insight into all wisdom’ (וּמְשַׁכְּלִים בְּכָל־הַכְּמָה); one might paraphrase: ‘intelligent enough to be educated in the Babylonian higher education system’); and 1:17 does not use the participle but the perfect form of the verb to express the idea that God imparted ‘understanding/insight into all literature’ to Daniel and his three friends. This, of course, is a noteworthy issue: these men did not merely possess human intelligence, but their intelligence came as a gift of God.

²⁷⁵ On the verb ‘show strength’ he says that these men are ‘steadfast in their loyalty to Judaism’ (Slotki 1951:97).

The term רבים also became a technical term in the Qumran community, designating the 'rank and file of the sect' (Collins 1993:385).

A number of scholars, among them Ginsberg (1953:402), Anderson (1984:140) and Davies (1985:110), rightly see in this section a reference to the Suffering Servant in Isaiah 52:13-53:12, in particular to 53:11 which states that the Servant will 'by his knowledge cause ... (to) the many to be righteous' (בְּדַעְתּוֹ יִצְדִּיק ... לְרַבִּים, my deliberately literal translation), and to 52:13 where we read that God's servant will 'prosper/succeed/act wisely,²⁷⁶ he will be high and lifted up, and very much exalted' (my translation, but cf. NASB; הִנֵּה יִשְׁכַּל עֲבָדֵי יְרוּם וְנִשְׂא וְנִבְהָ מְאֹד). Ginsberg (1953:402) in fact argues that the apocalyptic writer identifies the *maskîlîm* with the Servant of Isaiah 52:13-53:12, and the Many of his own day with the Many there. In fact, he proposes that the 'Maskilim, like the Servant, justify the Many,' and those who are martyred and who are resurrected (see Dn 12:3) become the 'justifiers of the Many' (Ginsberg 1953:402). Seow (2003:181) takes this up and says that according to this view of the Servant's suffering 'the "many" who see [it] will "perceive" or "understand."' Not only that, the Servant will, according to Isaiah 53, suffer and die innocently, but bear his suffering quietly for the salvation for others. 'This approach may have provided a model for the portrayal of quiet faithfulness in Daniel' (Seow 2003:181). Goldingay (1991:303) observes that the 'terms *the discerning* and *the multitude* hint at the idea that the calling of the servant of Yahweh described in Isa 52:13-53:12 ... is being fulfilled here, not only by the leadership but by the people as a whole who also suffer.' Similar sentiments are voiced also by Collins (1993:385). Wildgruber (2013:246) suggests that just as 'the Servant is successful despite outward appearances,²⁷⁷ so are the *maskîlîm* and 'those who know their God' who truly seek to understand God's working in history.

The מְשֻׁכְּלִים in Daniel 11 face persecution and death, possibly even the danger of apostasy²⁷⁸ and perhaps treason from inside since we are told that 'many will join them in hypocrisy [lit. with smoothness/ slipperiness]' (בְּדַלְקָלְקוֹת, Dn 11:33, NASB). In other

²⁷⁶ Seow's (2003:181) suggestion.

²⁷⁷ 'Der Gottesknecht hat Erfolg, allem äußeren Anschein zum Trotz.'

²⁷⁸ Daniel 11:33: 'they will tumble/totter by sword and by flame and by captivity and by plunder for some time [lit. days]' (וְנִכְשְׁלוּ בַחֶרֶב וּבְלֶהָבָה בְּשָׂבִי וּבִבְהָה זְמַנִּים); Daniel 11:35 'some of those who have insight will fall' ... for the purpose of 'refining, purging and making them pure' (וּמִן־הַמְשֻׁכְּלִים יִגְשְׁלוּ לְצַרוּר בְּהֵם וְלִבְרַר וְלִלְבֹן). The Hebrew word used to express the idea of the righteous 'falling' is כָּשַׁל, meaning 'stumble, totter' (BDB, HALOT), is normally used for physical falling, but it is also used metaphorically to express the falling of a person on the way of life (Harris 1999:457-458). According to Harman (1997:734) this is the more common meaning of the word, especially in the prophetic and poetic books. Lebram (1984:121) similarly argues that this expression 'bezeichnet in der Bedeutung "zugrundegehen" immer den Untergang des Sünders, im späteren Hebräisch die Übertretung des göttlichen Gebots.' Hence he concludes that in the present context this word also implies 'das Abweichen von Gottes Weg,' i.e. apostasy. Both leaders and followers are implicated in this falling away ('Zu den Strauchelnden gehören sowohl die Lehrer als auch die Vielen,' Lebram 1984:121).

words, not all those ‘who joined in the movement of resistance were sincere’ (Porteous 1965:168). Yet they will ‘be helped with a little help/receive some help’ (Dn 11:34; *יִבְהַבְּשֻׁלָם יַעֲזְרוּ עִזָּר מְעַט*). However, this time of danger and persecution for the faithful will only be for a certain time period ‘until the time of the end, for the appointed time is still to come’ (*עַד-עֵת קֵץ פִּי-עוֹד לְמוֹעֵד*).

Some scholars see in the expression ‘little help’ a hint at the Maccabean revolt (e.g. Montgomery 1927:458; Goldingay 1991:303). However, if that is so, the writer was obviously not at all impressed with their methods, but preferred ‘the action of the martyrs who proved their loyalty in the fires of persecution and contributed to the purifying of the community’ (Porteous 1965:168). Baldwin (1978:196-197) astutely observes that the fact that the Maccabean revolt is dealt with in such dismissive terms ‘would be an extraordinary viewpoint for an author in the years 165/164 to take, when the struggle against the Greeks was going in the favour of the Maccabean resistance, and the Temple was about to be rededicated (December 165 or 164 BC) unless, perhaps, he disapproved of the violent methods employed.’ Alternatively, the ‘little help’ may indicate ‘that few will genuinely share the “understanding” of “the wise” and give them wholehearted support’ (Lucas 2002:287).²⁷⁹

Unlike most scholars cited Chisholm (2002:322) thinks that verses 33-35 ‘summarize the early years of the Maccabean revolt and take us a few years beyond the death of Antiochus IV.’ He believes that verse 33a ‘probably refers to the priest Mattathias and his sons,’ who ‘suffered some setbacks (v. 33b), but eventually emerged victorious,’ and that the ‘little help’ refers to the Romans who apparently made an alliance with some of the Jews (Chisholm 2002:322). From the way the ‘wise’ are described this interpretation is in my opinion less likely, but due to the cryptic nature of the text it is impossible to be dogmatic. In any case, Steinmann (2008:531) rightly points out that the true helper of the faithful is God, not humans.

The purpose of God in this time of persecution and threat for the believer is ‘for purging ... and for purifying and for cleansing [lit. making white]’ (Dn 11:35, my

²⁷⁹ Redditt (1999:184) suggests that if one translates the phrase *יַעֲזְרוּ עִזָּר מְעַט* simply ‘they will receive little help’ (instead of ‘they will receive a little help’) the outlook ‘is even bleaker,’ though whether the Hebrew carries this nuance is difficult to say. Like Lucas he thinks that the phrase is ‘the author’s explanation of what he meant by “little help”’ (Redditt 1999:185). Steinmann (2008:531) argues that the phrase ‘is most likely a reference to all who remained steadfast in obedience to God’s Word and mounted some type of armed or passive resistance to the Seleucids.’ The Maccabees, in his opinion, ‘probably were only the best known of many who resisted Antiochus’ measures’ (Steinmann 2008:531). A similar view is propounded by Collins (1984:101) who suggests that as there is ‘no hint of militancy in Daniel and the author would scarcely have regarded the Maccabees as a help in the task of making the masses understand,’ it is ‘more likely’ that the expression ‘little help’ refers ‘to the few who shared the viewpoint of the *maskilim*.’

translation; ולְבָרַר וְלִלְבֵּן ... ולְצַרְוֹף). Steinmann (2008:531-532) is right to note a connection with Revelation 7:9, 13-14; 3:4-5, 18; 4:4; 6:11 and 19:14 (cf. also Collins 1993:386), though the terminology for cleansing and white garments in these verses is quite different from that used in the LXX of Daniel. He concludes that the persecution of Antiochus ‘ultimately served God’s purpose as it refined among the Jewish people those who would faithfully cling to his promise of deliverance in the Messiah’ (Steinmann 2008:532).

The time of persecution, as stated above, is for a limited time, עַד־עֵת קֵץ פִּי־עוֹד, ‘until a time of end, for the appointed time is still (to come)/until a time, an end, for still (it will continue) to the appointed time’ (my translation). Collins (1993:389) thinks that the expression refers to ‘the period when the crisis comes to its resolution.’ It is, however, significant that the section between Daniel 11:29-35 is framed by לְמוֹעֵד, as verse 29 begins with it and verse 35 ends with it. This might mean that indeed only the time of Antiochus’ persecution of the Jews is in view. However, the phrase עַת קֵץ only occurs here, at 11:40 (there with the preposition ב), 12:4 and 9 in the MT; if one includes the preceding preposition as well, the expression is עַד־עֵת קֵץ, which only appears here and in 12:4 and 9. In chapter 12, this expression refers to an unspecified ‘end time’ in the eschatological future. In my opinion this is the case also in the present context. In other words, though the present context fits that of Antiochus’ persecution to a large extent, this does not exhaust the meaning of the passage.²⁸⁰

2.4.3.5.6.1.2 Measures against All Religions (11:36-38)

Whereas Daniel 11:32-35 focused on the difference between faithful and unfaithful Jews during the time of persecution, verse 36 apparently returns to a description of Antiochus’ ‘achievements.’²⁸¹ There is, however, in verse 36 a significant change of phraseology. Chisholm (2002:325) astutely observes that only here is the tyrant of verses 21-35 actually called ‘the king’ (הַמֶּלֶךְ). Elsewhere it is simply ‘he’ (not even ‘King of the North’) except in verse 27 where reference is made to two kings who are sitting at the same table and dealing deceitfully with each other (וּשְׁנֵי־מְלָכִים; note the compound noun and the plural). Steinmann (2008:539) rightly perceives that in fact no other Hellenistic king is referred to

²⁸⁰ Parry (2011:500) also notes that the phrase לְמוֹעֵד פִּי־עוֹד at least allows ‘for the possibility that 11:36-39 describes events in the “time of the end”,’ though one does not have to interpret the text in this way. The identification is strengthened by the verbal connection between Daniel 11:36 and 9:26 and 27, which all use the verb חָרַץ (be determined, decided): Daniel 11:36 has כִּי גִתְרֻצָּה נְעֻשְׂתָּהּ, ‘that which is decreed will be done’; 9:26 has בְּחֻרְצָת שְׁמַמּוֹת, ‘desolations are decreed;’ and 9:27 has וְעַד־כְּלֵה וְנִחְרְצָה, ‘and even until a complete destruction, one that is decided’ (NASB).

²⁸¹ See e.g. Collins (1993:386) who argues that verse 36 ‘recapitulates the king’s behaviour during the persecution’ rather than continuing on from verse 35; also Goldingay (1991:304) who clarifies this resumption by translating ‘the northern king’, though the word ‘northern’ does not appear in the text

in this way; they are labelled either the ‘King of the South’ or the ‘King of the North,’ or ‘warrior king’ (מֶלֶךְ גִּבּוֹר) for Alexander the Great, but not just ‘the king’ as here. This and the reference to the ‘time of end’ in the previous verse probably indicate a change of ‘both timeframe and subject’ (Steinmann 2008:539). Therefore it is possible that though a number of the features that are reported in the following verses still tie in with the times of Antiochus Epiphanes, the reference here is to another, eschatological king and time. Antiochus foreshadowed this time and person to some extent, but not exactly.²⁸² Meadowcroft (2004a:244), looking at verses 40-45, also adopts the assumption ‘that there is a surface reference to events in the 160’s BCE ongoing [in verses 36-39 as well as 40-45], but ... there are also elements that point beyond them.’

‘The king,’ we are told, ‘will do as he pleases’ (וַיַּעַשׂ כְּרָצוֹנוֹ), just as the first king of Greece, Alexander the Great (Dn 11:3), and the king mentioned before him, Antiochus III (Dn 11:16), had done. Lucas (2002:289) opines that by implication there is a hint that this king, like his two predecessors, ‘will meet an untimely and unexpected end.’ Clifford (1975:25) notes that the phrase ‘is a Danielic expression for a tyrant’s military triumph just prior to disaster (8:4; 11:3, 16).’ Chisholm (2002:325) suggests that the close literary links with previous descriptions of kings in this chapter and with Daniel 8:4 (concerning the Medo-Persian empire) ‘may suggest that the king of [Daniel 11:36-39] epitomizes the pride and power of these previous kings and *transcends* the historical Antiochus IV. If so, the title “the king” ... is quite appropriate’ (italics added). Goldingay (1991:304) also suggests that the language here is a standard form of ‘description of apparently unchallengeable authority ... [which] presages unexpected disaster, or at least frustration and failure, and thus adds to the sense of expectancy that Antiochus’ success cannot continue’ (cf. also Page 1996:195). Buchanan (1999:36) observes that the title ‘king’ is used by the author of Daniel 11 ‘when a king won a significant battle (Dan 11:3, 16)’ and that it means that ‘no one could interfere with him. His power was compared to God’s.’

But this king not only does as he pleases in the human realm, but he usurps for himself what hitherto had been reserved for God. Up to now, he has waged a religious war against the Jews. From now on it seems, according to the angelic interpreter, he is against all established religion, including, but not restricted to, Jewish religion. It is said that he ‘will exalt himself and make himself great/magnify himself above all gods, and concerning

²⁸² Other interpretations apart from the two mentioned concerning the referent of verses 35ff have appeared throughout the ages. According to Anderson (1984:140) medieval Jewish interpreters saw here ‘a reference to the Fourth Kingdom,’ i.e. Rome, and Rashi apparently suggested that the abomination of desolation in the previous verses did not refer to Antiochus’ altar to Zeus but the Roman destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70, the reference in verse 31 to the Bar Kochba revolt of AD 132-135, and verses 36ff to ‘the Roman emperor Constantine’ (Anderson 1984:140-141). Anderson (1984:141) dismisses the view advocated by myself and others with Hartman and DiLella (1978:303) as “exegetically witless and religiously worthless”. I beg to differ.

the God of gods he will speak blasphemies (lit. wondrous things)' (Dn 11:36; וַיְתַרְוּמָם וַיְתַגְדְּלֵהוּ; עַל-כָּל-יְאֹל וְעַל-אֱלֹהִים יִדְבַר נִפְלְאוֹת, my translation). Lucas (2002:289) observes that the verbs translated 'exalt' and 'make great/magnify' 'are normally used in the HB only of God or of those who impiously challenge God.'²⁸³ Clifford (1975:25) sees here a reuse of 'the Canaanite myth of the rebellion in the heavens' that also appears in Ezekiel 28:1-19 and Isaiah 14:3-21, and in Daniel in chapters 7-8, 'where the earthly tyrant who threatens the holy people comes finally to speak arrogant words against Yahweh.' Collins (1993:387) suggests that since the statements in verse 37 do not quite tie in with Antiochus Epiphanes' policies, Daniel 'probably [employed] deliberate polemical distortion, to depict the impiety of the king in the most extreme terms possible.'

Because of all this, many conservative scholars argue that at verse 36 the referent changes from Antiochus to 'Antichrist' (or at least an Antichrist figure) because the descriptions given concerning this king go beyond what Antiochus did. Chisholm (2002:322) argues that 'one must make allowance for hyperbole here' and proceeds to show that Antiochus did in fact consider himself the creator of the world, according to 2 Maccabees 9:8. Furthermore, Chisholm (2002:323) rightly suggests that it may be best 'not to pit Antiochus against Antichrist' since it is 'most likely [that] Antiochus is a *type* of Antichrist, just as his abominable altar ... foreshadowed a future desecration of the temple (Matt. 24:15)' (italics added). In other words, though the writer uses hyperbole it is also possible, even likely, that this section actually transcends Antiochus and points to a later, eschatological, even worse ruler who would indeed abolish all other religious practices to exalt himself.

In his megalomania this king will disregard all other gods that people worship in the land, including 'the god of his fathers'²⁸⁴ and the desire of women' (Dn 11:37a), but especially the God of the Jews, the true 'God of gods' (Dn 11:36b). The expression 'desire of women' has often been identified as Tammuz-Adonis (e.g. Collins 1993:387; Lebram 1975:755), or as Dionisos (e.g. Bunge 1973:178). Lebram (1975:755) argues that Adonis is particularly suitable in view of the fact that Antiochus did in fact invade Egypt.²⁸⁵ The

²⁸³ Lucas (2002:289) also sees an echo of Isaiah's oracle against Assyria in Isaiah 10 (esp. v. 15).

²⁸⁴ Parry (2011:503) points out that the expression 'God of (one's) father' is in the MT always used for the 'God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.' Hence, he says, the term in this verse must refer to a Jewish king who 'will exalt himself over every god and will prosper until God's indignation has been completely poured out upon Jerusalem and the temple' (Parry 2011:503).

²⁸⁵ Lucas (2002:290) observes rightly that both Adonis and Dionisos 'were popular in Egypt' and so the point is 'that Antiochus shows contempt for the main gods favoured by both the Seleucid and Ptolemaic dynasties' (cf. Bunge 1973:181-182). Goldingay (1991:304) concurs that this may be so, but suggests that 'the seer may simply be expressing a theological distaste for what he sees as Antiochus's subservience of religion to politics.' Clifford (1975:25) suggests that the 'replacement of deities proper to each nation (Dan 11:37-38) represents an attempt to change what humans may not change, since the guardians of each nation are appointed by the president of the divine assembly (e.g. Deut 32:8-9...).'

problem, however, with all these suggestions is that there is no ‘evidence [at all] in the historical records that Antiochus ever opposed or forbade this ancient practice’ (Archer 1985, on vv. 36-39). Therefore the attack on religious practices in general substantiates the position that this section points to a different time sphere.²⁸⁶

The angelic interpreter comments that this king ‘will succeed until indignation is complete/until he has completed indignation, for that which is decided will be done’ (Dn 11:36b, my translation; *וְהַצְלִיחַ עַד-כָּלָה יוֹעַם כִּי נִחַרְצָה נֶעְשְׂתָה*).²⁸⁷ The word *יוֹעַם* ‘usually denotes the wrath of God’ (Miller 1994:307), and this seems to be the meaning here too.²⁸⁸ However, Collins (1993:386) thinks that the subject of the sentence is Antiochus and that therefore ‘the king is allotted a fixed period to indulge his wrath against Israel (thus “until his wrath is spent”).’ Collins argues that the interpretation given above, though not impossible, ‘goes against the tendency of Daniel to place the blame for the turmoil on the king’ (Collins 1993:386). In my opinion the two interpretations are not necessarily mutually exclusive, since God usually exhibits his anger through human beings, but the context here certainly does permit, and perhaps even favours, Collins’ interpretation. The last words of Daniel 11:36, *נִחַרְצָה נֶעְשְׂתָה*, are reminiscent of 9:26-27 (see above for comments on these verses).

Yet, though the king sets himself above all gods according to verses 36-37, verse 38 notes that he introduces a god that has been unknown so far, at least among his compatriots, a ‘god of mountain fortresses’ (*אֱלֹהֵי מְעֻזִים*) to whom he pays homage with (presumably sacrifices and) his wealth, and in whose name he apparently fights his future wars (Dn 11:39a). Perhaps this is a flashback to the king’s earlier reign, or maybe it is ‘a reference to the attention [the king] pays to his own military machine and his insatiable desire to oppress others’ (Longman 1999:283).

This ‘god of mountain fortresses’ has been identified variously as Zeus Olympios (e.g. Bevan 1900:26-30) or Jupiter Capitolinus (e.g. Montgomery 1927:463). Hengel (1974:284) however denies this and suggests that it was the ‘god of the Acra,’ who was worshipped by apostate Jews ‘and their Seleucid confederates.’ Lebram (1975:755-776) rightly points out that it is difficult to identify any of the Greek gods with this ‘god of the mountain fortresses’ since none of them could be designated ‘strange gods’ who were unknown to Antiochus’ predecessors. He suggests that the function of the ‘god of

²⁸⁶ A similar description of a ruler abandoning all worship except for that of himself appears in Revelation 13.

²⁸⁷ Ginsberg (1953:401) suggests that the apocalyptic writer of this passage saw here a fulfilment of the prophecy in Isaiah 10:24-26.

²⁸⁸ In Daniel *יוֹעַם* occurs here and in 8:19 where the angelic interpreter also referred to the ‘final period of indignation’ which ‘pertains to the appointed time of the end’ (NASB).

mountain fortresses’ is to help conquer fortresses (as implied by the name) and therefore that Daniel used a title that referred (even if logically not quite correctly, as he notes) to the *function* rather than the *cult* of this god (Lebram 1975:756; italics added). Bunge (1973:173) thinks the title ‘god of the mountain fortresses’ does indeed refer to Zeus, but that the Jew Daniel, like his contemporaries, would have considered this title simply as the Greek form of their own Semitic god ‘Baal Shamim’ (Bunge 1973:176). He argues that the ‘strange god’, the ‘god of mountain fortresses’ was known to Antiochus’ ancestors (‘fathers’), but not as chief god (Bunge 1973:176), and that he changed his allegiance to Zeus because he broke with the tradition of the Seleucids to worship Apollo, and denied this god the right to choose the rightful heir to the throne (cf. Bunge 1973:180-81, n. 4 of p. 180). Collins (1993:388) suggests that Daniel is once again engaging ‘in polemical exaggeration. Antiochus did what his fathers had not done by imposing a cult on Jerusalem ... Daniel takes the king’s break with tradition to an extreme by denying any continuity with his fathers.’ None of these suggestions is very satisfactory, and I believe that though Antiochus certainly foreshadowed the events foretold in this section, the text actually points to another, future eschatological figure.

In all of this, though the word ‘covenant’ is not mentioned, this king acts, and causes others to act, in direct contradiction to the first two commandments and thus against the covenant stipulations issued at Mt Sinai. This also applies to the next verse (Dn 11:39), especially since the king uses the help of a ‘strange god’ and ‘shares out land’ at will.

2.4.3.5.7 War with Nations, Including the King of the South (11:39-44)

Verse 39 tells us that this king will ‘act against the strongest fortresses (מְעִזִּים) with [the help of] a strange god (אֱלֹהֵי נֶכֶר), and to those he recognises/regards (הַכִּיר, Hiph pf 3ms of נָכַר) he will increase glory/honour, and he will cause them to rule over the many, and he will share out land for a price’ (Dn 11:39, my translation). Two things are significant in this verse: firstly, the use of the title אֱלֹהֵי for god which, with a few exceptions, only appears in the Writings;²⁸⁹ secondly, the words נֶכֶר and הַכִּיר, whose stem consists of the same consonants. The author apparently used them deliberately to create a word play (cf. Parry 2011:507). Clifford (1975:25) rightly observes that the reapportionment of the land was ‘another wresting of a divine prerogative since only God can apportion the land’ (e.g.

²⁸⁹ The exceptions are: Deuteronomy 32:15, 17; 2 Kings 17:41; Isaiah 44:8; Habakkuk 1:11; 3:3 (all except 2 Ki 17:41 poetic texts). The vast majority of the 58 occurrences, 41, appears in Job where it is obviously a preferred title for God. Schmidt (1997:115) notes that the singular אֱלֹהֵי occurs, with few exceptions, mostly in post-exilic literature (he apparently considers Job post-exilic). Fretheim (1997:405) rightly observes that אֱלֹהֵי is probably used there ‘to avoid specifically Israelite associations’ (note that the title is used of the god of a pagan ruler).

Lv 25:23; Josh 13; Is 34:17).²⁹⁰ Page (1996:196-197) suggests that the reference to the preferential treatment of people who supported Antiochus ‘might include the scandal caused by the sale of the high priesthood to one whose sentiments were pro-Greek’ and that the ‘valuation and sale of the land may echo the de-facto ownership of Jerusalem by the self-governing Acra after its construction.’

The interpretation of Daniel 11:40-45 has caused much perplexity among scholars. While these verses seem to continue the story of Antiochus Epiphanes up to his death, ‘they do not correspond in any way with the events following his second withdrawal from Egypt and the beginning of the persecution of the Jews’ (Lucas 2002:290). 1 Maccabees 6:1-17, 2 Maccabees 1:11-17, 2 Maccabees 9:1-29 and Polybius (*Histories* 31.9) all report on Antiochus’ final campaign and death, but they agree only on the facts that he embarked on a campaign in Persia, failed in an attempt to rob a temple, and met an untimely death, attributed either to sudden illness (1 Macc 6; 2 Macc 9, Polybius) or murder (2 Macc 1; cf. Lucas 2002:291), but this is all very different from the account in Daniel 11:40-45. This is the reason why most modern scholars take verse 40 as the transition from *ex eventu* to real, and in their opinion erroneous, prophecy (e.g. Collins 1993:388; Anderson 1984:142), whereas conservative scholars take this section as referring to an antichrist figure (or the antichrist), whether they actually use this term or not (e.g. Baldwin 1978:197-203; Longman 1999:280-283; Mihalios 2011:44²⁹¹).

Daniel 11:40 begins with another time marker, וּבְרֵעַת קֵץ, ‘and at [the] time of [the] end,’ (there is no definite article), words that were also found at the end of verse 35 (where they appeared in the form עַד־רֵעַת קֵץ, ‘until [the] time of [the] end’) and that will reappear in 12:1. This in itself sets this section apart, since it breaks the pattern of reported events between verses 36-39 without such a time marker. If one considers the time markers at the end of verse 35 and at the beginning of verse 40 to be boundary markers, then what has been reported from verses 36-39 has taken place in the interim period, whereas now in verse 40 the ‘time of the end’ has arrived and the angelic interpreter proceeds to tell Daniel what is going to happen at that point in history. Longman (1999:283) suggests the ‘end’ in view is ‘the end of the pride and life of the king who does as he pleases.’ Since 12:1-3 continues to look forward to the resurrection of the dead, Longman (1999:283) suggests that ‘this is a clue that the end (in its ultimate sense) is the end of time.’ Block (2006:51)

²⁹⁰ Parry (2011:506) takes the subject here to be the ‘foreign god,’ i.e. it is the foreign god who is acknowledged, who will ‘cause them to rule over the many’ and who ‘will apportion the land for a price.’ Though not impossible, this seems rather far-fetched, especially the last clause, which more naturally would suggest a human being as subject rather than a god.

²⁹¹ Mihalios (2011:44) writes: ‘I argue that the figure of Antiochus has become the pattern for God’s final adversary, who appears in the end-time hour. The king of 11:36-45 represents the actual eschatological enemy of God.’

however believes that the ‘end’ in view here is not the eschatological end time which is still future from our point of view, but the first coming of the Messiah, i.e. Jesus Christ. Collins (1993:389), as noted above on verse 35, believes that the ‘time of the end’ refers to ‘the period when the crisis comes to its resolution,’ but he is also adamant that since there is ‘nothing to indicate a change of subjects from the preceding passage ... there can be no doubt that the reference is to Antiochus [Epiphanes].’ As I argued above, I believe that the reference in the preceding passage is in fact not exclusively to Antiochus, but that he foreshadows a much worse figure to come in the future, and that this is what the present passage is all about. Collins (1993:389) in fact admits as much, since he continues to observe that the passage recalls eschatological passages from other prophets, and that ‘Antiochus is assimilated to a mythic pattern that underlies later Christian traditions about the Antichrist.’ Stahl (1994:193) states that verses 40ff report eschatological end-time events, though they do so through the lens of the political happenings at the time of writing.²⁹²

Daniel 11:40-45 once again reports a war between the ‘King of the North’ and the ‘King of the South.’²⁹³ Meadowcroft (2004a:249) observes that the continued vagueness of nomenclature in the chapter means that ‘there is nothing in these final verses ... that requires the interpreter to read the King of the North as Antiochus IV.’ In fact, he believes, rightly I think, that ‘the King of the North is a composite identification of the Seleucid emperors throughout chapter 11,’ and that ‘the maintenance of the kings of the North/South terminology permits a degree of multivalence ... which is best appreciated in literary terms’ (Meadowcroft 2004a:249). This means that in his opinion the events of the previous section continue in Daniel 11:40-45 ‘into the anticipated future’ which, while apparently carrying on the description of warfare between the Seleucid and Ptolemaic empires, points ‘towards a larger significance and culmination in [the] future’ (Meadowcroft 2004a:249). He rightly points out that both in verse 40 and 45 the word קֶץ appears, in verse 40 in a general term pointing to future events, but in verse 45 specifically pointing to the ‘end’ of the despicable ruler (‘his end’):

²⁹² Buchanan (1999), in contrast to the two opinions just outlined, believes that verses 40-45 do not refer to Antiochus IV Epiphanes or to an antichrist figure, but to Antiochus III the Great. In his opinion Daniel 11:40-45 is ‘a second summary of a historical event in the life of Antiochus III,’ an ‘appendix’ and alternative to 11:14-19 (Buchanan 1999:365). This is an interesting suggestion, but I am not convinced by his argument that this is in analogy to other duplicate accounts, e.g. in Genesis 2 of a second creation account. All other examples (except Genesis 2) he lists are vague and refer to duplicate accounts in different books, such as Isaiah 36-39 which is almost identical to 2 Kings 18:17-20:19 (which he does not specify but only alludes to). In addition, the duplicates are usually well marked. Genesis 2:4 for example begins by explicitly stating that ‘This is the account of the heavens and the earth when they were created.’ In Daniel 11:40 there is no such marker to indicate that the reference is to a previous happening. However, the fact that in this verse the title ‘King of the North’ appears, for the first time since 11:15 where it indeed refers to Antiochus III, is a point in Buchanan’s favour.

²⁹³ Meadowcroft (2004a:248) remarks that throughout the chapter ‘the North/South terminology recalls the Assyrians and Babylonians from the north and the Egyptians from the south’ of Israel’s earlier history.

This variegated usage of the term *gets* ... indicates that the anticipated end of the Seleucid King of the North is a temporal end, but that his end foreshadows a greater end, the culmination of all earthly kingdoms and the establishment of the eternal kingdom. It points to a future that looks like the past but is something quite different from the past (Meadowcroft 2004a:250).

The reign of the last King of the North is framed by events including international warfare, and verses 40-45 comprise the last war of this ‘despicable person.’ The initiative lies with the King of the South who will ‘engage in butting with the King of the North’ (יִתְנַגַּח עִמּוֹ מֶלֶךְ הַנִּגְבִּי; Dn. 11:40, my translation), but the King of the North will ‘rush in upon him with chariots, with horse-men and with many ships’ (Dn 11:40; וַיִּשְׁתַּעֲרֵן וַיִּשְׁתַּעֲרֵן עָלָיו מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן בְּרֶכֶב וּבַפָּרָשִׁים וּבַאֲנִיּוֹת רַבּוֹת, my translation; cf. HALOT for וַיִּשְׁתַּעֲרֵן). The King of the North will, in fact, not just war against the King of the South, but also against other nations, since we are informed that he will also enter ‘[other] lands and overflow and pass through²⁹⁴ [them],’ (Dn 11:40, 42), among them ‘the beautiful land’ (Dn 11:41). ‘Many [of these lands]²⁹⁵ will fall,’ but the victory of the King of the North will not be universal, since a number of nations will escape, or perhaps ‘be left alone’ (יִמְלֻטוּ): ‘Edom, Moab, and the foremost sons of Ammon’²⁹⁶ (Dn 11:41).

Why these nations should escape is not clear, but Lucas (2002:291) proposes that ‘the point is that the “flood” will be confined to the western side of the Jordan’ (cf. Miller 1994:311, who notes that these nations are perhaps not ‘in the path of Antichrist’s armies’).²⁹⁷ Seow (2003:185) suggests that the author here attempts prediction of what will happen to Antiochus, and that the three nations that will escape the ‘flood’ will do so because they will ally themselves with him, though of course this is not explicitly stated. Perhaps Seow’s suggestion is more likely (though unnecessarily restricted to Antiochus).

Verse 42 tells of more attacks on other nations, including Egypt, which will not escape, and verse 43 shows how the King of the North will plunder the riches of Egypt: ‘he will rule over the hidden stores of gold and silver and all the precious things of Egypt,

²⁹⁴ For וַיִּשְׁתַּעֲרֵן cf. הִשְׁטָף יִשְׁטָפוּ in v. 22; for וַיִּשְׁטָף וַיִּשְׁטָף cf. v 10: וַיִּשְׁטָף וַיִּשְׁטָף where the same phrase applies to Antiochus the Great. This would be a point in favour of Buchanan’s argument that this section refers back to him.

²⁹⁵ The feminine plural רַבּוֹת indicates that countries are meant, not generally people, for which the masculine plural would be used.

²⁹⁶ Baldwin (1978:203) believes that the expression בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן ‘implies the best of the nation of Ammon.’ She further suggests that since the expression is used in poetry to mean ‘the flower of a people or nation ... whose destiny is being determined,’ it probably is ‘a hint that in the context these nations stand for typical enemies of God’s cause.’

²⁹⁷ Collins (1993:389) rightly comments that these nations are ‘aligned with Belial and the Sons of Darkness in 1QM 1:1’ and that the Edomites and Ammonites were attacked by Judas Maccabee. In light of this it is surprising, he says, ‘that they are not listed as [Antiochus’] allies’ (Collins 1993:389). See below on 1QM 1:1.

and the Libyans and Cushites²⁹⁸ [will be] *at his heels*' (Dn 11:43, my translation, but cf. NASB).²⁹⁹

2.4.3.5.8 The King's Demise – Ignominious End (11:45)

However, in the middle of this campaign the king will be disturbed by rumours from other parts of the country (i.e. the east and north), presumably of insurrection, that will 'terrify him' (יִבְהֶלְהוּ, cf. HALOT; Dn 11:44). As a result, he will 'go out in great anger to destroy and exterminate many' (Dn 11:44, my translation). Miller (1994:312) suitably comments: 'Furious that anyone would dare oppose his power and authority, the evil dictator will arrogantly marshal his forces against the enemy with the intent of totally obliterating them.' Presumably on his way back 'he will pitch the tents of his palace between the seas, towards the mountain of glory and holiness, but his end will come, and there will be no one to help him' (Dn 11:45, my translation).

Most commentators assume that the reference to the 'end' of the tyrant here refers to his death, but Buchanan (1999:422) proposes that the expression here does not refer to the man's death, but simply to the end of his (in Buchanan's opinion, Antiochus III's) expansionist activities. A word search on the combination of בוא and קץ in the MT suggests that though the expression 'come to [an, the] end' can certainly mean death, it more often seems to have the connotation 'coming judgment from God,' without necessarily meaning the complete destruction of the people or thing[s] judged.³⁰⁰ Most important for the present context is Lamentations 4:18 where the writer complains to God that 'our end has come' (בָּא קֶצְנוּ). The reference is to the end of a nation, to judgment received by God, though there are some survivors to tell the tale and mourn over God's judgment. Like in Daniel 11:45 there is a personal pronoun suffix (1cp) to indicate that

²⁹⁸ Egypt's western and southern neighbours, cf. Lucas (2002:291).

²⁹⁹ Buchanan (1999:363) translates verse 43 in such a way that the verb 'rule' also governs the last phrase: 'He will rule the treasuries of gold, silver, and all the precious things of Egypt, and the Libyans and Ethiopians in his footsteps.' Slotki (1951:100) translates 'at his steps' and explains that this could mean either 'joining his army, or placing themselves at his beck and call.' The expression בְּמִצְעָיו, which is literally 'in his footsteps,' or perhaps rather 'in the wake of' the king, presumably to add to the damage done by the King of the North, is translated 'in submission' by the NIV. The NLT also takes the view that the Libyans and Cushites are subservient to the invader, rather than allied with him as the literal translation seems to imply. Miller (1994:311) argues that since it is the 'Antichrist's conquests [that] are in the forefront' in this section, this is the preferable position. The text is not easy but as noted I prefer a translation that takes into account that this refers to an eschatological time.

³⁰⁰ In Genesis 6:13, God tells Noah that because of the people's sin on earth, the 'end of all flesh' has come. Yet though the destruction then reported is extremely far-reaching, it is not universal in that Noah and his family as well as representatives of all animals are preserved throughout the judgment on the world. Similarly in Jeremiah 51:13 God pronounces judgment on Babylon. Again, the ultimate result was the end of the Babylonian empire, but it did not imply that every single Babylonian was in fact killed. Ezekiel 7:2, 6 and Amos 8:2, like Jeremiah 51:13, pronounce judgment on a nation, in this case Judah and Israel respectively. Both would be destroyed by foreign forces, but the destruction still left a remnant of survivors. Ezekiel 21:30 [Eng. 25] pronounces judgment on Judah's king Zedekiah, whose time of punishment [בָּא יוֹמָם בְּעֵת עֲוֹן קָדְוָה] has come. Zedekiah was indeed captured and then tortured and killed by the Babylonians.

someone's 'end' has come. Admittedly, there is no preposition, but the grammatical expression is nevertheless quite similar. Considering these examples, Buchanan (1999:422) certainly has a point when he suggests that the 'end' here spoken of need not necessarily imply the tyrant's death. However, since in Daniel the reference is to an individual rather than a nation (cf. Ezk 21:30), it is perhaps more likely that it is not just his political career that is finished, but his life.³⁰¹ With the end of the tyrant comes, implicitly, also the end of his oppression and policies (cf. Page 1996:197). Wildgruber (2013:244) points out that unlike the tyrant who ends 'without help,' the *maskilim* are among those who will rise to everlasting life (12:2) and 'shine brightly like the brightness of the expanse of heaven' (12:3, NASB). The king's might seemed invincible, but was ultimately short-lived. The *maskilim*'s efforts seemed ineffective, but turned out to be lasting in the end.

2.4.3.6 Conclusion of the Vision Report: The 'Time of the End' and Daniel's Task (12:1-4)

Daniel 12:1 begins with yet another time marker, 'at that time' (וּבְעֵת הַהִיא),³⁰² i.e. referring to the 'time of the end' just described. The angel prince Michael will 'stand up'³⁰³ for his people³⁰⁴ and apparently be an instrument in the ultimate salvation of the Jews.³⁰⁵ In other words, Michael is not just one of the angels, or even one of the angel princes, but has the particular task of protecting God's people, including, if necessary, military intervention (Anderson 1984:147).³⁰⁶

³⁰¹ In addition, I am not in agreement with Buchanan's conclusion that since (in his opinion) the text here refers to Antiochus III, 'there is no part of the Book of Daniel that was originally prophecy' but a 'detailed history written in a dramatic style to celebrate the victory over the Seleucids' (Buchanan 1999:422-423).

Parry (2011:515-516) takes the pronominal suffix as a reference not to the king, but to the immediately preceding phrase הַרְיָצִיבֵי־קִדְשׁ. Though it is true that this phrase is closer to the adverbial phrase עַד־קִצְוֹ than 'the King of the North,' one wonders whether this interpretation is not inspired by his presupposition that the fulfilment of the prophecy is the destruction of Jerusalem by Vespasian. Parry (2011:516) argues that קִצְוֹ here as in 9:26 refers to the sanctuary, but as I pointed out above at 9:26, קִצְוֹ there could also (and, in analogy to the same reasoning Parry uses here, namely proximity of antecedent, more likely so) refer to a person.

³⁰² The words עַתְּ הַהִיא appear three times in this verse, twice with the preposition ב and once with the definite article preceding them. The expression בְּעֵת הַהִיא occurs a number of times in the prophets and may designate both references to times of judgment (e.g. in Jr 8:1) as well as times of salvation (e.g. Jr 31:1).

³⁰³ Nickelsburg (1972:11) suggests one of two meanings in the present context: 'a) He who "stands over," i.e., "is the leader of" your people,' or 'b) He who "stands up for," i.e. "is protector (or defender) of" your people.' He goes on, rightly I believe, to suggest that in the context of Daniel 10-12 it is the second meaning that is to be preferred. Cf. Hartman & DiLella (1978:260), who translate the verse: 'At that time Michael, the great prince, the *protector* of your people, will arise' (italics added; cf. NASB where Michael 'stands *guard*' over Israel).

³⁰⁴ Davies (1985-1998:115) rightly suggests this is not the whole nation of Israel, but those 'written in the book' who remain faithful during the time of trial.

³⁰⁵ Slotki (1951:100-101) points out that Jewish exegetes (he does not name them) usually take Daniel 12 to refer to the future coming of the Messiah, though he himself advocates a setting in Antiochus' days, after his death.

³⁰⁶ Collins (1993:390) notes that the connotation of the verb עָמַד that is used here is disputed, since depending on the context it can mean 'to protect,' 'to withstand,' 'to arise,' 'to serve,' or synonymously with קָוַם 'to appear on the scene' etc. In the present context it appears to have the meaning 'to stand over' in the sense of 'to protect' (Collins 1993:390). He accepts Nickelsburg's (1972:11-14; cf. Anderson 1984:146) suggestion that in Daniel 12:1 it also

If Daniel 12:1-4 speaks about an eschatological future time frame (cf. e.g. Anderson 1984:146; Hammer 1976:115), then in my opinion so does Daniel 11:40-45, to which 12:1-4 is connected through the words *וּבְעֵת הַהִיא*. In 12:1 the angel tells Daniel that it will be a time of great ‘distress,’ greater than any other that has ever come upon people before (*עַתְּ צָרָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא-נִהְיִתָּהּ מִקִּיּוֹת גְּוֵי עַד הַעֲתָת הַהִיא*).³⁰⁷ Hammer (1976:115) observes that ‘the point of [Israel’s] greatest anguish is the point of her exaltation. The new age can only be entered through suffering.’³⁰⁸ Yet, though a tyrant is ruling over God’s people, they are not without hope. The expression *עַת צָרָה* appears with slight variations (mainly personal pronoun suffixes) also at Judges 10:14; Nehemiah 9:27; Psalm 37:39; Isaiah 33:2; and Jeremiah 14:8, 15:11 and 30:7. All of these passages refer in one way or another to a time when God will judge Israel, but there is usually also an indication of their ultimate deliverance. Jeremiah 30:7 has perhaps the closest affinity to Daniel 12:1 (cf. Collins 1993:391; Buchanan 1999:374; Mihalios 2011:48) as it speaks of a time of distress for ‘Jacob,’ i.e. God’s people who are oppressed by the Babylonians, and promises that they will be rescued from exile there. Since Daniel 9 refers explicitly to Jeremiah, it is not unlikely that Daniel alluded to this prophet elsewhere too.³⁰⁹

The last reference to *בְּעֵת הַהִיא* in verse 1 introduces the idea that at this time of judgment some will be rescued, namely those whose name is written ‘in the book.’ This is most likely the ‘book of life’ (*סֵפֶר הַחַיִּים*, perhaps more accurately translated ‘the book of the living;’ see Ps. 69:28; 87:6) where the names of the righteous are recorded (cf. Collins 1993:391). Gowan (2001:152) aptly comments that to speak ‘of such a record is to offer assurance that every righteous person is known to God and will not be forgotten.’³¹⁰ The

connotes a judicial meaning, a notion that has much to commend it since it ‘provides an attractive parallel to Daniel 7 where the climactic scene is also judicial and the motif of heavenly books is also found’ (Collins 1993:390). This is also borne out by the present passage, since the prediction of people rising to either eternal life or eternal reproach implies judgment. Moreover, Collins (1993:390) sees a parallel to 11Q13 (Melchizedek) 2:13 where Melchizedek executes God’s judgment and thus has a role similar to the angelic prince Michael, who also has both military (Dn 10) and judicial functions (Dn 12:1). Elsewhere, Collins (1974b:57) suggests that the defeat of the tyrant in 11:45 (he identifies him with Antiochus) coincides with the rising of Michael. This event, so Goldingay (1991:306) ‘underlies the defeat of the northern king.’

Doukhan (1987:100) rightly observes that the ‘standing up’ (*עמד*) of Michael in this verse is in contrast to the ‘standing up’ (or arising, *עמד*) of kings in chapter 11. In each case, another king arose to take power instead of a previous one, thus bringing the previous king’s rule to an end.

³⁰⁷ Similar expressions are found in Exodus 9:18, 24; 1 Maccabees 9:27; and in the NT: Mark 13:19; Matthew 24:21; Revelation 16:18 (cf. Collins 1993:391).

³⁰⁸ Cf. Acts 14:22 where Paul and his companions strengthened ‘the souls of the disciples, encouraging them to continue in the faith, and saying, “Through many tribulations we must enter the kingdom of God”’ (NASB).

³⁰⁹ Buchanan (1999:374) suggests that the present text is ‘a fulfilment of Jeremiah’s prophecy’ in that the Jews had experienced deliverance ‘at the Battles of Beth-horon and Beth-zur’ where the ‘yokes of Antiochus III and Antiochus IV had been broken.’ Collins (1993:391) rightly observes that here in Daniel the difference is that not all will be saved (or perhaps better, ‘escape,’ *יִמָּלֵט*, as implied in Jr 30:7), but only those ‘found written in the book,’ i.e. those who remain faithful to ‘pure Yahwism as opposed to its syncretized form’ (Page 1996:198).

³¹⁰ Elsewhere this book is simply labelled ‘book’ (cf. Ps 139:16; Ex 32:32-33) or called ‘something written,’ i.e. a ‘record’ (as translated e.g. by the NASB; cf. Is 4:3; Ezk 13:9). In Malachi 3:16 the expression ‘book of remembrance’ occurs, which seems to imply the same book. Collins (1993:391) explains that in the OT the ‘book of life’ ‘seems to refer to membership of the covenantal community.’ In the Aramaic section of Daniel we read of

theme of books of life and judgment is of course taken up in the NT in Revelation (3:5; 13:8; 17:18; 20:12; 21:27), and Paul mentions it in Philippians 4:3 (NASB). Jesus alludes to it in Luke 10:20 (cf. also Hbr 12:23) when he speaks about the disciples' names being 'recorded in heaven.' What has been nascent in the OT is made explicit in the NT where the believers' eternal bliss is spelled out in more detail.

Daniel 12:2 gives hope not only to survivors of the persecution, but even to those who died in it (or will die in it, lit. 'those who are sleeping [in] the land of dust,'³¹¹ מִיִּשְׁנֵי אֶרֶץ-עָפָר), since 'many' (רַבִּים) of them will rise up (lit. wake up), some to 'eternal life,' whereas others will rise to 'eternal reproach and abhorrence' (יִקְיִצּוּ אֶלֶּה לְחַיֵּי עוֹלָם וְאֶלֶּה לְחַיֵּי עוֹלָם לְחַיֵּי עוֹלָם לְחַיֵּי עוֹלָם; cf. also Young 1949:256; Seow 2003:188). This promise of resurrection, which incidentally is the first time that a double resurrection is introduced³¹² (Mihalios 2011:49) and the only explicit reference to resurrection in the OT (cf. Collins 1993:392; Sternberger 1972:273; et al.), answers the question of 'God's sovereignty even over death' (Gowan (2001:152). More veiled allusions to the concept of resurrection are found, for example, in Hosea 6:1-2; Ezekiel 37:1-13 and possibly Isaiah 26:19 where 'the restoration of Israel' is expressed using the imagery of 'bringing the dead back to life' (cf. Lindenberger 1985:186). Here in Daniel 12:1 Daniel 'says something new and distinctive ...: that God's desire for justice, God's will for human life, cannot be frustrated even by death. ... God can set things right *even* beyond this life' (Lindenberger 1985:186; italics his). Daniel predicts both eternal bliss and eternal judgment. He is mainly encouraging believers who are suffering and dying for their faith, but there seems to be an implicit warning to those who die denying it. God's sovereignty over death includes his sovereignty over those who have died, both faithful and unfaithful, and to reward or punish as the case may be. This would of course be particularly relevant for believers who suffered under Antiochus IV and might be tempted to deny their faith.

The section ends as the angel tells Daniel to keep the things or words he has just heard 'shut up' and to 'seal' the document where he has written them 'to the time of the end' (Dn 12:4). Goldingay (1991:309) suggests that sealing does not just mean conservation, but withholding what Daniel has heard till an appointed time. Miller (1994:320) however points out that the sealing of documents in the ANE included the identifying marks of the parties involved as well as the scribe who wrote it up. The

books being opened in the court of justice of the Ancient of Days (Dn 7:10). In that text the reference is apparently both to books of judgment and the book of life (cf. Collins 1993:391).

³¹¹ Lindenberger (1985:184), to whom I am indebted for this more literal translation, notes that this 'land of dust' is 'the underworld abode of the dead.'

³¹² In a footnote Mihalios (2011:49, n.144) adds that though scholars such as Collins (1993:396) believe that 'Judaism had already introduced the idea of resurrection in the Enoch corpus' which is generally believed to be older than Daniel, 'it could very well be that 1 Enoch borrowed from Daniel rather than the other way around.'

document was then duplicated and placed in a safe place to be available if necessary for consultation (cf. Jr 32). It is likely that the same applied here (cf. Miller 1994:320-321). In other words, Daniel was not told to hide the document so that at some future time its meaning could be better understood, but to safeguard it; presumably an open copy was available for inspection (cf. Longman 1999:285).³¹³

The reference to ‘many’ running to and fro, apparently to gain knowledge, is reminiscent of Amos 8:11-12, which speaks about a famine not for food, but for God’s word. Seow (2003:190) suggests that the present text is a reversal of Amos 8 in that instead ‘of people roaming about in a desperate-but-vain search for the word of God, now “many” – perhaps the “many” who are resurrected from the dead (12:2) or the “many” who have been led to righteousness by the resurrected servants of God (12:3) – will roam the earth and knowledge will be increased.’³¹⁴

In contrast to this interpretation, Redditt (1999:192) thinks that the phrase ‘running back and forth’ may have ‘meant that many members of the larger Judean community would be vacillating back and forth between their traditional faith and Hellenism,’ with the result that ‘evil shall increase’ (following the translation offered by the NRSV which is based on OG). This emendation is also accepted by Collins (1993:369, 399) and Hartman & DiLella (1978:261), but all these scholars look at the last word of the verse in the MT (תַּעֲרָרָה) which OG has apparently emended to read תַּעֲרָרָה. However, the text of the last phrase of Daniel 12:4 in the OG is in fact quite different from the Hebrew³¹⁵ and Theodotion³¹⁶: ‘ἕως ἄν ἀπομανῶσιν οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ πλησθῆ ἡ γῆ ἀδικία.’ According to Swete’s Greek-English Interlinear Septuagint (2012) one might translate this: ‘while the masses/many rage on³¹⁷ and the earth is filled with injustice/wickedness.’ It seems that OG had a different Vorlage here (cf. Meadowcroft 1995:262), and since the Hebrew text makes good sense without any emendation, I believe, with most English translations, that the original Hebrew is to be preferred. Therefore I do not think that Redditt’s position is correct.

³¹³ Baldwin (1978:206) adds that the ‘hiding’ may be likened to the reasons for Jesus’ teaching in parables: ‘much that was of value was hidden except to those who wanted it sufficiently to give all in exchange for it.’ Isaiah too was told that people would hear his message but not understand, see it but yet not perceive (Is 6; cf. Baldwin 1978:207).

³¹⁴ Goldingay (1991:309) similarly observes: ‘When Daniel’s book is unsealed, during the Antiochene crisis, that famine ends.’ Those who are ‘running about desperately seeking [God’s word] ... find what they are looking for,’ i.e. increasing knowledge (Lindenberger 1985:184).

³¹⁵ תַּעֲרָרָה תַּעֲרָרָה (many will roam about and knowledge will increase).

³¹⁶ Theodotion reads: ἕως διδασκῶσιν πολλοὶ καὶ πληθυνθῆ ἡ γνῶσις (until (or while) many have been instructed (or taught) and knowledge has been increased (or multiplied)).

³¹⁷ ἀπομαίνομαι means ‘to rave, rage to the uttermost,’ according to Liddell (1996). Lust, Eynikel, & Hauspie (2003) actually give the translation ‘to recover from madness.’ Neither of these suggested meanings seems to have anything to do with the original Hebrew word תַּעֲרָרָה, which means ‘to roam/rove around/about’ (cf. HALOT).

2.4.3.7 Excursus: How Is the Resurrection in Daniel 12:1-3 to Be Understood?

The question that arises in the context of Daniel 12:1-3 is whether Daniel here infers universal or limited resurrection. Most scholars argue for the latter. Collins (1993:392) believes that ‘Daniel does not envisage universal resurrection,’ since the preposition מִן precedes the phrase ‘those who are sleeping in the dust.’ In his opinion this should be understood ‘in a partitive sense’ as Daniel’s focus is ‘the fate of the faithful’ (Collins 1993:392). Hartman & DiLella (1978:307), in a more detailed treatment of the issue, argue that though the term רְבִיִּים may be a Semitism for ‘all,’ the preposition מִן which follows precludes one from taking it this way.³¹⁸ They contend further that the author here is not interested in the whole of humanity, but simply in the fate of Jews, both faithful and apostate.³¹⁹ Sternberger (1987:274), considering the use of רְבִיִּים at Qumran (e.g. in 1QS 6:1; CD 13:27) also prefers a more limited interpretation: the members of the isolated community are in view, and thus Israel, the chosen people, not a universal resurrection, and both the resurrection to eternal life and the resurrection to eternal reproach apply to Jews in this context.³²⁰

A few scholars, however, believe that Daniel 12:2 may at least hint at general resurrection. Hasel (1980:280) argues that the resurrection spoken of in Daniel 12 ‘takes place at the turning point of the aeons.’ Apart from including God’s people who remained faithful in the persecution, ‘the larger apocalyptic context of the Daniel pericope points in the direction of a resurrection to everlasting life that is neither restricted to Israelites nor does it include all Israelites’ (Hasel 1980:280). Thus, the distinction between those who rise to eternal life and others to eternal reproach could also be interpreted differently, as pointing to universal resurrection, though one cannot be dogmatic. Young (1949:256) similarly suggests that the wording does ‘not exclude ... general resurrection, but rather impl[ies] it.’ Miller (1994:318) observes that the resurrection of the righteous and the wicked does not necessarily take place at the same time, but that Daniel may here telescope the two events. He does not believe that universal resurrection is in view in Daniel. Mihailios (2011:49-50) argues that the repetition of the phrase ‘some ... and some’

³¹⁸ Yet others have suggested that the preposition has an explicative force (Williams 2007:124, §326; cf. Hasel 1980:277-278), but in view of the context and the general usage of רְבִיִּים elsewhere in the MT this is less likely than the partitive sense (cf. Hasel 1980:279).

³¹⁹ Snaith (1944:89, n. 2) calls this ‘a partial “general resurrection”’ (cf. also Hasel 1980:278). Mowinckel (2005:273) speaks of ‘the most righteous and the worst sinners’ who would ‘arise to everlasting life and to everlasting contempt, respectively’ (cf. also Davidson 1904:528; Eichrodt 1967:514). Eichrodt (1967:514) states: ‘It is significant that this form of the resurrection hope is not extended to the nation as a whole, but only to a greater or lesser number of its members. ... In the forefront ... stand those who have been brought safely through the great tribulation, and in whom God’s providence has preserved for itself a people to inherit the eschatological salvation.’ In a footnote he points to Daniel 12:1 (Eichrodt 1967:514, n. 4).

³²⁰ Goldingay (1991:308) suggests an even more limited interpretation: the resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked is for the sake of vindication, the former being vindicated for their faith in the persecution, the latter for their persecution of the former, whereas ‘the regular mass of faithful Israel’ apparently remained ‘in Sheol,’ the place for the dead.

‘refers to a subdivision of the many (both righteous and wicked are resurrected) and does not contrast the *some* with others that are not resurrected.’

Considering the lexical evidence, the exact expression *חַיֵּי עוֹלָם* occurs only here in the MT; in Psalm 133:3 *עַד-הָעוֹלָם* appears: God promises everlasting life as a blessing on brothers who dwell together in unity (Ps 133:1). In the DSS the expression *חַיֵּי נֶצַח* is used,³²¹ sometimes by itself, sometimes in connection with *עוֹלָם*. This basically also means ‘everlasting life’, but *נֶצַח* has replaced *עוֹלָם*. The idea behind *עוֹלָם* and *נֶצַח* seems to be the limitless quality of that which is being described, in these cases limitless bliss of life (cf. Collins 1993:392). This also applies to the opposite, the limitless ‘reproach and abhorrence’ of those who (by implication) are not following God’s ways (cf. Is 66:24, the only other verse where *דֵּרְאוֹן* appears). Collins (1993:393) rightly states that ‘Daniel does not elaborate on the punishment of the damned and makes no mention of a fiery hell, but he does seem to go beyond Isaiah 66 in having the sinners restored to life to experience their disgrace,’ just as the righteous experience their bliss. The *maskilim*, ‘those who have understanding,’³²² together with ‘those who make the many righteous,’ in contrast to those who experience everlasting reproach and abhorrence, ‘will shine like the brightness of the firmament ... like the stars, forever and ever’ (Dn 12:3, my translation, but cf. NKJV).³²³ This is, as Efron (1987:141) correctly observes, in contrast to the downfall of the despotic tyrant of Daniel 11:45.

Seow (2003:188) suggests that these ‘wise’ ones are those ‘who, like the suffering servant portrayed in Isaiah 40-55,³²⁴ accept their suffering and even death with quiet courage in order that “many” might be brought to understanding.’ Like Efron, he

³²¹ CD 3:20; 1QS 4:7; 4Q228 1i:7; 4Q257 V (3a i, 3b):4; 4Q511 2i:4; 6Q18 2:2.

³²² Page (1996:198) suggests also the following definitions: ‘those who have knowledge of this coming time of trouble, or those who comprehend the true nature of Antiochus’ policies.’

³²³ A discussion on the development of the belief in a resurrection is not possible in the limited space here. The following remarks may suffice. Moore (1983:30ff) suggests a combination of prophetic and wisdom provenance for the resurrection idea here in Daniel, precisely because of Wisdom terms such as *maskilim*. He writes: ‘The Apocalypticist ... brought together elements from both prophetic and sapiential circles to fashion an explicit statement about the resurrection of the dead and the immortality of those righteous souls who held firm to their religious faith in the face of a persecution which demanded their very lives’ (Moore 1983:29). Birkeland (1950:60-78) on the other hand believes that apart from developments in Israelite history and special revelation from God the idea of personal resurrection in Israelite religion was also influenced by Iranian Zoroastrianism. Whether there was indeed influence from Persia has, however, been challenged. Efron (1987:140, n. 81) for example points out that ‘neither [Daniel 12:2] nor any of the Daniel visions on redemption disclose any clear direct connection with Persian tenets.’ Efron (1987:140, n. 81) concludes that the ‘faith emerging from the Book of Daniel can be understood as confrontation with the world around rather than as passive absorption of its beliefs.’ In my opinion, this position is to be preferred. Similarly, Sternberger (1987:290) concludes that the reference to resurrection in Daniel 12:2 is not an isolated incident, but the conclusion of a long development in the thinking and theology of Israel which can be traced to a number of different traditions, such as prophecy and psalms.

³²⁴ That there is an echo of the fourth Servant Song here has been pointed out by other scholars as well, e.g. Ginsberg (1953); Baldwin (1978:205-206); Buchanan (1999:175f, who lists Is 52:13 and 53:11 as parallels); Wildgruber (2013:163). Van der Woude (1997:71) however doubts this. He believes that in Palestinian Judaism the Servant of Isaiah 53 was (as far as we know) never interpreted as ‘[a] collective entity, but as a (presumably messianic) individual,’ and in addition, the martyrdom of the maskilim in Daniel 12 was not described as ‘propitiatory.’

believes that the fact that these wise ones will ‘shine like the brightness of the sky’ is ‘a dramatic reversal of the situation described in 8:10 where the arrogant “little one” (Antiochus) is depicted as one who ascends the heavens, casting down some of the hosts thereby’ (Seow 2003:188). In Daniel 12 the seer ‘envisions ... the vindication of the fallen *maškilim*, ... in terms that are reminiscent of the hosts of heaven assuming their rightful stations in the sky after they have been cast down by Antiochus,’ thus repeating the theme ‘of the exaltation of the lowly and the humiliation of the arrogant’ (Seow 2003:188).³²⁵

2.4.4 Epilogue: The Last Conversation between the Angel and Daniel (12:5-13)

These last few verses of Daniel 12 are both a conclusion to the vision in chapters 10-12 and the whole book (Redditt 1999:194; Seow 2003:191). Many scholars consider this section as a later addition (e.g. Seow 2003:191). However, it is not necessary to assume this since the section is intricately related to the preceding two chapters by means of terminology³²⁶ and themes. For example, Daniel 10 begins with Daniel and the heavenly visitor by the river, and Daniel 12:4-13 takes up this setting.

Daniel continues to look and sees two more (or more literally, two ‘other’) angelic figures standing on either side of the canal where he is. He then hears one of these two figures speaking to the man dressed in linen (see 10:5), asking when the end of the ‘wonders’ (הַפְּלִאוֹת) so far revealed would take place (12:5-6).³²⁷ The ‘one dressed in linen’ who is positioned ‘above the waters of the river’ answers, with ‘both hands lifted up’ in oath,³²⁸ and swears ‘by the One who Lives Forever’ (בְּהוֹי הָעוֹלָם), giving the enigmatic information that the end would be ‘for an appointed time, appointed times, and a half’ (my translation; לְמוֹעֵד מְוָעָדִים וְחֻצִי) and ‘as soon as they finish shattering the power of the holy people, all these events will be completed’ (Dn 12:7, NASB; Hebrew: וְכִבְלֹת נִפְץ יַד-עַם-קִדְשׁ

³²⁵ Seow (2003:189) continues to outline the similarity to Isaiah 53:11, especially as it occurs in 1QIs^a, and to Matthew 13:43, texts that obviously echo (or are echoed by) Daniel 12:3. Collins (1974a: 34) proposes that Daniel here ‘describes the final coming together of the two spheres of life [i.e. the earthly and the heavenly] by the elevation of the just to join the angelic host,’ based on the notion that elsewhere in the Bible and extrabiblical literature angels and stars are equated (Collins 1974a: 34 lists Jdg 5:20; Job 38:7; 1 En 80:6; 2 Apoc Bar 51:10). Mowinckel (2005:274) observes that the two concepts of ‘light’ and ‘life’ are parallel and synonymous in the present context.

³²⁶ Such as משכילים, קץ, בין, עמד; cf. Wildgruber (2013:255) who rightly notes that the concluding verses of Daniel 12:5-13 correspond to the introduction to the vision in 10:1-11:2a.

³²⁷ Though the OG indicates that the conversation was not between angelic figures but between Daniel and Michael, (‘then I spoke to the one clothed in linen,’ cf. Swete) the MT is more likely to be correct in the context, especially in view of the parallel text in Daniel 8:13-14 (cf. Collins 1993:399). Collins (1993:399) suggests that the word פלא may point to Antiochus Epiphanes, since the same word is used for that king’s misdeeds in Daniel 8:24 and 11:36. He says: ‘If the reference is the same here, the angel is asking not about the end of the resurrection and judgment but about the end of the events described down to the end of chap. 11’ (Collins 1993:399).

³²⁸ Driver (1900:204) suggests this lifting of both hands serves ‘as the more complete guarantee of the truth of what is about to be affirmed’ (cf. Baldwin 1978:207). Collins (1993:399) notes that ‘Lifting both hands is especially emphatic;’ so also Longman (1999:286) and others.

תְּהַלְלִינָהּ כְּלִיאֵלָה). Collins (1993:399) and others (e.g. Charles n.d.:142-143) suggest a slight emendation of the text,³²⁹ in line with OG, and translate ‘at the end of the power of the shatterer of the holy people,’ but he thinks that in ‘either case the reference is to the death of Antiochus’ (Collins 1993:399; cf. Porteous 1965:172). Since the MT does make sense, even though it is not easy to interpret, it should be retained. A different interpretation of the idiom נָפַץ יָד is offered by Steinmann (2008:566) who proposes that it may mean to ‘thrust away the hand,’ in the sense of “‘reject a covenant relationship with” the Jewish people.’ In this case, the phrase ‘would refer to the time during which they reject the Messiah.’ This is a possible scenario, though perhaps a little too definite, as is his belief that the ‘wonderful things’ here, as in Daniel 11:36 refer to *the* antichrist, not to Antiochus (Steinmann 2008:568-569). Though I generally agree with this position, I would modify it slightly to ‘an antichrist figure,’ not necessarily ‘*the* antichrist,’ though ultimately this cannot be ruled out. Nevertheless, whichever of these readings is preferred, Seow (2003:193) is surely right in stating that some, if not the whole, of the mystery remains, even when direct revelation, as here, is involved.

The reference to ‘an appointed time, appointed times, and a half’ (or ‘a period, periods, and half a period/part of a period,’ (לְמוֹעֵד מוֹעֵדִים וְחֶצְיָי (לְמוֹעֵד מוֹעֵדִים וְחֶצְיָי) is the same as in Daniel 7:25, עֶדְנָן וְעֶדְנָנִין וְפִלְגַּ עֶדְנָן.³³⁰ Most scholars have understood this as meaning a more or less precise period of three and a half years (Collins 1993:322). Collins (1993:322) continues to note that ‘[t]he calculations of 8:14; 12:11, 12 can be understood as attempts to specify the length of this period more exactly.’³³¹

However, other scholars consider the expression as symbolic without reference to an exact period of time. Steinmann (2008:570), writing from a Lutheran perspective, considers ‘the three and a half times in Daniel’s visions (7:25; 12:7)’ as a ‘symbolic period representing the time frame from the first advent of the Messiah to the final judgment of the Antichrist.’ Longman (1999:286) also proposes that Daniel does not intend ‘to give a precise time period but rather’ indicates ‘that just as wickedness seems to be gaining momentum, it will be slowed and then stopped.’ Baldwin (1978:146), commenting on 7:25, similarly remarks that the ‘expected progression, one, two, three is cut off arbitrarily but decisively.’ Goldingay (1991:181) concurs, noting that the Aramaic term עֶדְנָן (and by implication the Hebrew term מוֹעֵד) is not a different way of denoting ‘a year.’ Nor is the expression ‘time, times and half a time’ ‘a convoluted way of saying 3 ½ periods. It

³²⁹ This emendation involves the repointing of נָפַץ and transposition of that word with טָ (cf. Collins 1993:399).

³³⁰ BDB points out that the Aramaic term עֶדְנָן may be an Assyrian loanword meaning ‘appointed, or definite time,’ i.e. the meaning is essentially the same as the Hebrew of Daniel 12:7.

³³¹ See below on a more nuanced treatment of 12:11-12.

suggests a time that threatens to extend itself longer: one period, then a double period, then a quadruple period ... but the anticipated sequence suddenly breaks off, so that the seven periods (in effect an eternity) that were threatened are unexpectedly halved' (cf. also Keil & Delitzsch 1996:651-652). What this means in exact years and days is not indicated (Goldingay 1991:181). Pace (2008:341-342), commenting on 12:7, similarly concludes that the 'poetic expression' *time, times and half a time* is 'open-ended,' and that in view of this 'the man clothed in linen provides assurance [to Daniel and his readers] *that* the suffering will cease, but the obscurity of the time line prevents any assurance of *when* [it] will end.' In my opinion, in view of the enigmatic nature of the text the symbolic interpretation is to be preferred.

The rest of the verse, *וּכְכֹלֹת נִפְיָן יְדַע־קֹדֶשׁ תִּכְלֶינָה כָּל־אֱלֹהִים*, 'and when the shattering/smashing of the hand/power of [the] holy people is completed, all these [things] will [also] be completed' (my translation) is also enigmatic. Lebram (1984:122) suggests that the similarity of *נִפְיָן* (smash, shatter) to *פּוֹץ* (scatter, e.g. in Dt 4:27 of God scattering Israel among the nations) had already caused Greek translators to think here of the end of the diaspora of the Jews. Thus the context could be interpreted as meaning that after the three and half appointed times the expected 'end' would coincide with the return of Israel to their own land (Lebram 1984:122). Later on he explains in more detail that this vague reference may mean the end of the desecration of the temple, and the concurrent time of distress for the Jews, or the end of the diaspora. Thus, so Lebram (1984:136), it is possible to see a deliberate ambiguity: on the one hand, the belief in the truth of the prediction in Daniel 7:25 of three and half times to the end of the persecution, but also the possibility that the end of the diaspora is in view, a time in the indefinite future. 'Wer kann wissen, was für Gott dreieinhalb Zeiten sind!' (Lebram 1984:136).

Daniel hears the words, but does not understand (*וְלֹא אָבִין*) their meaning and asks for clarification, *מָה אֶתְרִית אֵלֶּה* ('What will be [the] end of these [things]?' Dn 12:8³³²), but instead of being given a specific time frame he is simply told to go and 'get on with life' (Longman 1999:286), since his prophecy was sealed up for the time of the end (Dn 12:9). Baldwin (1978:208) notes that 'the full significance of the revelation is hidden even from Daniel' and that the word 'sealed' here 'is meant to be taken metaphorically,' since Daniel hears but does not understand the meaning of the message.

In a recapitulation of what has already been stated (Collins 1993:400), Daniel is told that the time until the end would be a time of unprecedented troubles, during which

³³² Note the term *אֶתְרִית* which harks back to 10:14.

the wicked would be ever more wicked and fail to understand the signs of the time (וְהַרְשִׁיעוּ),³³³ whereas ‘those who have insight’ would ‘gain understanding’ (וְהַמְשִׁפְּלִים יִבְיִנוּ) and ‘purify themselves’ (Dn 12:10; cf. 11:35). Incidentally, the verse has a chiasmic structure in Hebrew, with the ‘many’ who purify themselves and the *maskilîm* who ‘understand’ marking the beginning and end of the verse, and the wicked who become ever more wicked and fail to understand being at the centre.³³⁴ Baldwin (1978:208) rightly comments that ‘suffering is neither accidental nor meaningless, but serves the positive goal of purifying, cleansing and refining God’s people.’ She adds that the ‘refining process which improves the quality of gold and silver at the same time separates out the dross, that is *the wicked*’ (Baldwin 1978:208). Thus, ‘suffering will prepare a people for the immediate presence of their Lord’ (Baldwin 1978:209; cf. also Goldingay 1991:309).

The angel continues to tell Daniel that ‘from the removal of the regular offerings and the setting up of the abomination that causes desolation [there will be] 1290 days’ (my translation; וַיִּמְעַת הַיּוֹסֵר הַתְּמִיד וְלָתֵת שְׂקוּיָן שְׁמָמִים יָמִים אֶלְף מֵאָתַיִם וְחָשְׁעִים), but promises blessings to those who would be patient enough to endure to 1335 days (Dn 12:12). These two enigmatic numbers have given rise to a number of different interpretations and a wealth of literature. Many scholars assume that they were added when the events of 164 BCE did not turn out as expected and thus these numbers are seen as corrections of earlier calculations (cf. e.g. Seow 2003:192; Collins 1997:78). This does not explain, however, why the earlier numbers were left standing. Steinmann (2008:572-573) rightly observes that all extant complete copies of Daniel contain all three numbers (8:14; 12:11, 12). If therefore a shorter book had been circulated with a number that subsequently proved to be wrong (and not containing 12:11-12), it is unlikely that a section with a correction would have been added to all the copies in circulation (Steinmann 2008:573). On the other hand, if the corrected number had been added later, why, as noted, were the wrong numbers not excised (Steinmann 2008:573)? The fact that the book gained widespread acceptance despite the ‘false’ numbers speaks against the theory of addition.

Mathews (2001) also argues against a simple updating of the numbers in Daniel 8 and 12, but uses a different argument. She proposes that the numbers are related to so-

³³³ Collins (1993:400) perspicaciously points out that the Hiphil form in the phrase וְהַרְשִׁיעוּ is reminiscent of the phrase מְרַשְׁעֵי בְרִית in 11:32.

³³⁴ The text begins וְהַמְשִׁפְּלִים יִבְיִנוּ וְהַתְּמִידִים יִתְהַרְרוּ וְהַמְשִׁפְּלִים יִתְהַרְרוּ וְהַתְּמִידִים יִתְהַרְרוּ, ‘many will purify themselves, and make themselves white and they will be refined’ (my translation). The first two Hebrew words are Hithpaels, which may indicate, as in the translation offered, reflexives, or, if one follows HALOT, the clause could be translated with passives (and this is probably to be preferred): ‘many will be sifted, cleansed, and refined.’ Steinmann (2008:566) points out that in 11:35 the same verbs are used with active meanings and ‘God as the implied agent.’ If the passive translation is adopted, this is also the case here.

called rounded triangular numbers.³³⁵ Moreover, she notes, correctly I believe, that all the numbers in Daniel are intentional, all in one way or another relating to each other and with a particular symbolic significance ‘especially in terms of sabbatically ordered time’ (Mathews 2001:645). In her opinion, Daniel 12:11-12 ‘gives expression to the fullness of time, the consummation of history, and the inauguration of God’s kingdom by augmenting one week of 7 days (of years) (i.e. $7 \times 365 = 2,555$) by adding 70 (= 2,625).’ In this way, ‘The 70 weeks of years of Daniel 9 (and the 70 years of the hero’s service) are ... associated with 1,290 and 1,335 to show that the ultimate consummation of time, the end of Daniel’s work, and the struggle of Jerusalem ... are closely related’ (Mathews 2001:644).³³⁶

The numbers in Daniel 12 link up with Daniel 9:27 which describes the first, ‘bad’ half of the week, the time of desecration (represented by the numbers $3 \frac{1}{2}$ in Dn 9, 1150 in Dn 8, and 1290 in Dn 12; Mathews 2001:644). In contrast, the number 1335 represents the ‘good’ half of the week, the time of fulfilment of Jeremiah’s prophecy, ‘and marks the “end” period in which the people of the Most High will gain triumph after the desolation’ (Mathews 2001:645). Mathews (2001:645) concludes: ‘Thus, Daniel uses the sum of 1,290 and 1,335 to suggest that the one week will end on a momentous restorative note. In fact, it is the ultimate victory of God’s people and the “end of days,” that is, the culmination of history.’ In how far the complexity of this argument is likely to have been in Daniel’s (or his readers’) mind when he wrote this section is of course a matter of speculation (and seems rather unlikely for someone who is not mathematically trained). However, the conclusion that Mathews draws (i.e. that the numbers are intentional and

³³⁵ The basics of the system of plane numbers were developed by Pythagoras, and was known to Philo of Alexandria as well as educated people in the late first century AD, though more thorough treatment appears in mathematical works of the second century AD (cf. Bauckham 1998:391-392). It is possible, given the fascination with Pythagorean arithmetic in ancient times, that these significant numbers were known to (the writer of) Daniel as well.

A triangular number is the sum of successive digits, e.g. 10 is the triangular number of 4, i.e. $1 + 2 + 3 + 4 = 10$. This would be the fourth triangular number by definition (since the digits 1, 2, 3, and 4 are added up; Mathews 2001:634). Mathews (2001) also uses square and rectangular numbers in her argument which are defined as follows: Squares are the result of all odd numbers in a series added up (or a number multiplied by itself), e.g. 9 is the third square: $1 + 3 + 5 (= 3 \times 3) = 9$ or $1 + 3 + 5 + 7 (= 4 \times 4) = 16$ etc. ‘A rectangular number is the sum of all the successive whole even numbers up to and including the number in the series’ (Mathews 2001:636) (or $n \times (n + 1)$): e.g. $2 + 4 + 6 (= 3 \times 4) = 12$ or $2 + 4 + 6 + 8 (= 4 \times 5) = 20$ etc.

³³⁶ She continues: ‘Dan 9:27 speaks of one week ... but stops after telling only the first half of it. Dan 12:11 refers to the first half-week, as do Dan 7:25 and 8:14, whereas Dan 12:12 tells of the second half referred to in 9:27’ (Mathews 2001:644). Mathews (2001:641) argues that Daniel uses rounded triangular numbers in 8:14, 12:11 and 12:12 ‘to avoid connecting such especially “good” numbers to the evil period of desecration’ described in these contexts. Moreover, the two numbers in Daniel 12 add up to 2625, which is $1290 + 1335 + 70$, ‘exactly the number of days in a week of years plus 70’ (Mathews 2001:641).

Mathews (2001:645) continues to argue that ‘Daniel’s focus on the last of the 70 weeks in the apocalyptic section of his work serves to bind it to the narrative section by virtue of the hero Daniel’s service of 70 years and the length of the exile in Daniel 1-6.’ The numbers $3 \frac{1}{2}$, 7, 49, 70 are ‘sabbatically ordered numbers’ and to be taken symbolically rather than literally (Mathews 2001:644-645). ‘By means of 2,555 plus 70, Daniel wishes to indicate that the one final full week of history is his main emphasis throughout the whole book. Using a week of days plus 70 is a way of symbolizing a pregnant week, that is, one that moves into its completion in the context of ultimate fulfilment’ (Mathews 2001:645).

point to God's victory at the end of days) is more convincing than arguments that the numbers were simply chosen as 'good guesses' after the prophecy had proved wrong.

The book closes with the assurance that though Daniel would die (lit. 'you will rest,' וַתָּנוּחַ), 'at the end of days' (לְקֵץ הַיָּמִין) he would arise to his 'lot' (וַתֵּצֵמַד לְגֵרְלָהּ).³³⁷ Redditt (1999:199) points out that the word used to describe Daniel's death (נָוָח) 'means more than simply taking one's ease.' He thinks, rightly I believe, that included here is also the idea of ceasing from one's work since it is finished, as well as death (Redditt 1999:199). But death is not the end for Daniel. He would rise again to his 'destiny,' presumably together with the wise of verse 2 who were promised resurrection and life after death. Thus Daniel is 'assured of his place in God's future' (Redditt 1999:199).

2.4.5 Conclusion – The Covenant Theme in Daniel 10-12

Daniel 10-12 is the longest and most detailed of the vision reports. A whole chapter describes the setting (Dn 10). Daniel 11 reports the history of the ANE, in particular of Palestine and Egypt, as it affected the Jews during the time of the Persian and Greek empires, with particular focus on the latter. Daniel 12 concludes the vision report and gives Daniel's reaction to it. Unlike Daniel 9, these chapters are not saturated with covenant language, though the theme does appear in the report of the last king whose reign would lead to severe persecution of the Jews and test their commitment to their covenant God.

The word 'covenant' (בְּרִית) appears in Daniel 11:22, 28, 30 and 32. In Daniel 11:22 the expression נְגִיד בְּרִית, 'prince of the covenant,' occurs. A נְגִיד can be either a secular ruler (king) or a religious figure (priest). Therefore the expression נְגִיד בְּרִית can refer to either a political or a religious leader. The fact that the expression is indefinite may well mean that several referents may be implied (cf. Steinmann 2008:526). If the covenant refers to a political alliance, obviously a secular figure is in view, but if the covenant refers to the Sinai covenant, then a religious leader, i.e. the current high priest, is more likely the referent, though a Davidic king would not be ruled out altogether. I suggested that in that case one might possibly narrow the meaning of בְּרִית to the priestly (or Davidic) covenant, though this is, of course, not necessary. In fact, most scholars suggest the reference is to the death (or at least removal from office) of Onias III.

³³⁷ Raurell (1993:527) suggests that Daniel 12:13 forms an inclusio with Daniel 12:1-3. He comments on the LXX, which differs from the Theodotion version, and in particular on the word δόξα, 'glory,' where Theodotion has κληρος, 'lot,' which is actually what appears in the MT (גֵּרְלָהּ). Raurell maintains that the use of δόξα in this verse 'represents for the Septuagint translator the opportunity of giving the term ... a theological-eschatological meaning which was already known by Isa-LXX and which afterwards will inspire Wisdom in close dependence on Dan 12,2-3.13' (Raurell 1993:532) as well as other 'apocalyptic texts of the intertestamental' period (Raurell 1993:530).

Three times the expression *בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ*, ‘holy covenant,’ appears. Daniel 11:28 reports that the King of the North has ‘set his heart against the holy covenant.’ In Daniel 11:30, the same king is threatened by ‘ships of the Kittim’ who come against him, and as a result he becomes ‘enraged against the holy covenant,’ takes action against it, and in the process favours those who ‘forsake the holy covenant.’ This rage against the ‘holy covenant’ entails, according to Daniel 11:31, the desecration of the sanctuary, the abolishing of regular sacrifices and the introduction into the sanctuary of the ‘abomination [that causes] desolation,’ i.e. in short the abrogation of Jewish religious and cult practices.

It was noted that the phrase *בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ* can be interpreted in several different ways: 1) it may refer either to the Jewish nation in general (e.g. Seow 2003:179; Miller 1994:301; Stahl 1994:192 ‘Gemeinschaft von Juda’) or more specifically the community of faithful law-abiding Jews. 2) The phrase may refer to Israelite religion in general (Charles n.d.:130) or the practice of Jewish religion. 3) Others equate the ‘holy covenant’ with the Mosaic law (Hengel 1974:305). 4) Another interpretation modifies view 2 and considers the ‘holy covenant’ a reference to ‘the carrying out of God’s established cult by the legitimate priesthood’ (Lebram 1970:512). I argued that these four views are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but should perhaps be seen together. I suggested that this was probably the reason for the indefinite expression *בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ*, rather than a definite *בְּרִית הַקֹּדֶשׁ*, since if it was definite, it would almost certainly indicate the sanctuary. However, being indefinite, ‘covenant of holiness/separation’ can refer to either things (‘covenant of sanctuary/holy things’) or people (‘covenant of holy people’).

But the enemy would not only be external (the King of the North and his forces), but also internal, since a number of Jews would succumb to the seductions of the King of the North and deny their religious (and national?) affiliation. In the context of the latter threat, the unique expression *בְּרִית מְרִשְׁעֵי* is used which only appears in Daniel 11:32 and in 1QM 1:2. It is reminiscent of the *בְּרִית עֲזָבֵי* in Daniel 11:30, and seems to describe the same people. In Daniel 11:32, the reference is obviously to apostates, Jews who could not withstand the pressures of the secular ruler to give up their religious loyalties, and who thus collaborated with the enemy rather than standing firm in their faith even unto death if necessary. The next few verses contrast these ‘violators of the covenant’ with those who remain steadfast in the persecution, the *מְשֻׁכְּלֵי עֵם*, those who ‘have insight among the people.’ Thus, though the word *בְּרִית* does not occur again, Daniel 11:33-35 continues the covenant theme nonetheless. These *מְשֻׁכְּלֵי עֵם*, however, also go through a time of testing, and ‘some of [them] will fall’ (Dn 11:35), but only to show that the exception proves the rule, and to show that the others in fact will be refined, purged and made pure for the end of time (Dn 11:35). It is these *מְשֻׁכְּלֵי עֵם* who reappear in Daniel 12:2-3 as those who will rise

again to eternal life (and in Dn 12:4, 13 where Daniel himself is counted among those מְשֻׁבְּרִים who will rise again; cf. Dn. 1:17), so that there, too, the covenant theme continues, even if obliquely. The covenant theme also appears, though veiled, in Daniel 11:36-40 where the king continues to refuse to accept Israel's God, but instead worships his own god (perhaps even his own creation, since the 'god of fortresses' is not known otherwise).

3 Covenant in the Damascus Document (CD), the Community Rule (1QS), the Hymns Scroll (1QH^a) and the War Scroll (1QM)

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 Recent Developments in DSS Research

The initial assumption that D (the Damascus Document, including the cave 4 fragments) and S (1QS plus fragments found in other caves) describe more or less the same community was challenged from early on in DSS research (e.g. Burrows 1956:230; Lohse 1964:64; Davies 1982a:93). It is now widely believed that the ‘Dead Sea Scrolls refer to different kinds of communities’ (Collins 2009:351) and that though Qumran was certainly a settlement where one such community resided, it was not the only one that existed. Much research is being conducted regarding the relationship especially between D and S as well as the different manuscripts of D and S respectively. This change in perception will be apparent throughout the present study though it will not receive special comment except where necessary for my argument. For example, an attempt will be made not to speak about the ‘Qumran community’ in general, but to use terminology that refers to the particular scroll in question. The same applies to arguments concerning the composite nature of the documents, especially CD and 1QS.

The issue of whether S or D came first is also debatable. Cross (1995:96-97; cf. Collins 2009:358) and Regev (2003:231, 262; 2010:431, 448) believe that S came first, whereas Hultgren (2007) and Collins (2009:358) believe that D precedes S. The scope of this work precludes me from entering the discussion, but on the whole I find the latter option more likely. It is possible, though perhaps not very likely, that a closer investigation of the particular terminology used in connection with the word ‘covenant’ will throw some light on this question. The issue of the relationship between the different manuscripts of any one work, though interesting in itself, will only be touched upon occasionally when opportunity arises.

3.1.2 Use of Terminology

In respect of the scrolls under consideration, terms like ‘writer’, ‘author,’ ‘editor’ or ‘redactor’ are used more or less synonymously for stylistic reasons, though sight has not been lost of the composite nature of the texts at hand and the different shades of meaning these words normally have. References to columns in the DSS will be in Arabic digits (e.g. Column 1, line 3 will be 1:3), except in quotations where the author uses Roman numerals.

This investigation is based on ‘The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition’ (hereafter referred to as DSSSE) and the Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Edition (DSSEL). It will generally follow the order used in DSSEL. Occasionally reference will be made to Charlesworth’s and other editions.

3.2 Explanatory Notes on Selected Sections of the Damascus Document (CD) with Special Reference to Covenant Terminology

3.2.1 Introduction to the Damascus Document

3.2.1.1 The Nature of the Damascus Document

The Damascus Document was first discovered by Solomon Schechter among other manuscripts in the Cairo *Geniza* in 1896 (VanderKam 1994:55). Its two manuscripts (A and B)³³⁸ date to the tenth (A) and twelfth (B) centuries CE (Hempel 2000:16), but fragments of similar documents were discovered among the finds in Qumran caves 4 (4Q266-273), 5 (5Q12) and 6 (6Q15; VanderKam 1994:56). The earliest of these (4Q266) comes from the Hasmonean period, i.e. ‘the first half or middle of the first century BCE’ (Baumgarten et. al. 2006:1), the latest from ‘the early first century CE’ (4Q268 and 270; Baumgarten et. al. 2006:2).³³⁹ The cave 4 finds show that the text of CD is relatively stable (Baumgarten et. al. 2006:1), and ‘definitely a Qumran text’ (Baumgarten & Schwartz 1995:6), but also that manuscripts A and B and the cave copies may represent different recensions (Baumgarten 1995:6). The issue deserves further investigation, but is beyond the scope of the present study.

Despite a number of affinities there are also many differences between CD and other Qumran texts such as the Serekh ha-Yahad (1QS) (for some of these see Baumgarten & Schwartz 1995:6). As noted above, this has led to a shift in recent scholarship regarding the nature of the sect represented in CD. Hultgren (2007:535-539) for example argues convincingly that the community of the Damascus Covenant in CD was the parent movement for the Yahad that is described in 1QS, and this is the view that will be adopted here.

How the document ended up in Cairo is a moot question. Hempel (2000:17) suggests that the manuscripts may have belonged to a find made by Arabs in the Middle Ages (ca. 800 CE), who informed the Jews in Jerusalem, who in turn brought the books that had been discovered to Jerusalem. There they may have been copied and somehow two copies found their way to the Jewish community in Cairo and eventually its *geniza* (Hempel 2000:17).

³³⁸ Manuscript A consists of 16 columns, and manuscript B of two. In the first edition these latter were labelled columns 19-20, but they partly overlap with columns 7-8 of manuscript A.

³³⁹ 4Q271 and 5Q12 are dated palaeographically a little later than 4Q266, i.e. to the late Hasmonean or early Herodian period (Baumgarten et al. 2006:1); 4Q267, 269 and 272 are early Herodian (i.e. 31-30 BCE; Baumgarten et al. 2006:1-2).

It is interesting that CD apparently had some significance for at least one Jewish group outside the DSS community, whereas all the other DSS remained hidden until their eventual discovery in 1947 and later. Its sometimes less than sectarian character may have been the main reason why it was not completely eliminated from public circulation. Obviously the Jews in Cairo did somehow identify themselves with at least part of the document. This may also explain why certain sections that are present in the 4Q fragments are left out in the CD ones.

3.2.1.2 The Purpose of the Damascus Document

In my opinion, the purpose of CD is to outline for (new) members of the sect it describes what it entailed to be part of this group. The document includes a detailed description of the group's provenance, as well as their view regarding the keeping of the Mosaic law. Warnings against apostasy are included as a deterrent, but this document does not give a detailed list of curses and blessings, but simply refers to them, presuming that the (new) members are familiar with the relevant sections of Leviticus and Deuteronomy.

3.2.2 The occurrences of בְּרִית in the Damascus Document

There are forty-one occurrences of the word בְּרִית in CD, plus sixteen more in the 4Q fragments. These will be examined in turn, paying attention to specific expressions, such as 'covenant of the forefathers/former covenant' and the like, which will be considered as they appear in the text. The 4Q fragments are not considered separately if they are simply parallel occurrences to CD; in those circumstances, the parallel in 4Q will be noted in brackets.

3.2.2.1 CD 1:1-2:1

The Damascus Document begins by calling on its readers, namely 'those who know righteousness' (יודעי צדק),³⁴⁰ to 'hear' (שמעו) and 'understand' (ובינו) God's 'covenant lawsuit' (ריב)³⁴¹ and judgment (CD 1:1-2) on Israel (lit. 'all those who despise him,' בְּכָל מְגַאצִּיר) because of her unfaithfulness to God. Words of 'knowledge' are important for this

³⁴⁰ The opening words of CD are almost identical to Isaiah 51:7 (שִׁמְעוּ אֵלַי יְדַעֵי צְדָקָה); cf. Davies 1982a:64; Campbell 1993:90, 93f). Davies (1982a:64) thinks that CD 1:1a may be a quotation of this verse, but apart from the three words יְדַעֵי צְדָקָה ... שִׁמְעוּ there are no other similarities of our text to Isaiah 51; therefore, I think it is merely a similar turn of phrase rather than a deliberate allusion or quotation.

³⁴¹ Davies (1982a:57) correctly observes that though the word רִיב occurs here, the following lines do not outline a new law suit, but merely constitute the 'disclosure of an existing dispute.' Therefore, this is not a 'formally prophetic announcement but didactic instruction' (Davies 1982a:57).

writer, as they are for Daniel; in the first line two occur: ידע (know) and בין (understand). The word ריב is the first hint at covenant language in this document (cf. Jr 25:31;³⁴² Hos 4:1; Campbell 1993:93), but though the word occurs twice more in CD (at 1:21 and 14:12), this is the only instance where it actually has covenantal overtones.

The writer continues: ‘When in their treachery (במועלם³⁴³) they abandoned him He turned away from Israel and from His sanctuary and gave them up to the sword; but when He remembered the covenant of the forefathers, He left a remnant³⁴⁴ to Israel and did not allow them to be totally destroyed’ (DSSEL, CD 1:3-5a).³⁴⁵ Here we have the first occurrence of ברית, in the phrase ברית ראשונים, literally the ‘first’ or ‘former covenant’ or ‘covenant of the first ones,’³⁴⁶ which DSSSE and DSSEL translate ‘covenant with/of the forefathers’ respectively. Who are these ראשונים, and what does the covenant mentioned here refer to? The writer notes that God ‘remembered’ the covenant of the ראשונים (ובזכרו) (ברית ראשונים). This is reminiscent of Exodus 2:24-25 where it is stated how God ‘remembered’ his covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob³⁴⁷ (ויזכר אלהים את-בריתו) (את-אברהם את-יצחק ואת-יעקב) when he heard the groaning of the Israelites during their Egyptian slavery and showed his concern. Just as the Exodus narrative then tells how God acted on behalf of his people by sending Moses to them as their deliverer, so CD continues to describe how, because God recalled the covenant with the forefathers, he acted by not completely destroying his wayward nation, but left them a remnant. One might therefore

³⁴² There are definite verbal similarities between CD 1:2 (כי ריב לו עם כל בשר ומשפט יעשה בכל מנאציו) and Jeremiah 25:31 (כי ריב ליהוה בגוים נשפט הוא לכל-בשר). Apart from Jeremiah 25:31 and Hosea 4:1, the phrase ל כי ריב also occurs at Micah 6:2, and without כי at Hosea 12:3.

³⁴³ The noun מעל as well as the verb מעל appears in Daniel 9:7 where Daniel confesses his own and his people’s waywardness: במעלם אשר מעל-יָדָךְ (cf. Schwarz 1965:4). Wacholder (2007:143, cf. Schwarz 1965:4) may well be right in considering the text an allusion to Ezekiel 39:23-24. He notes that CD’s paraphrase ‘preserves Ezekiel’s three motives – the treachery of the house of Israel, God’s hiding his face, and handing them over to the sword’ (Wacholder 2007:143).

³⁴⁴ The two themes of ‘remnant and devastation of the land’ are closely associated with that of covenant in CD (Davies 1982a:59), and ‘the virtue of these “first ones” is what leads to the salvation of the later remnant’ (Grossman 2002:111).

³⁴⁵ See also 4Q268 1:12. 4Q268 includes eight lines that precede the text with which CD starts. The column starts apparently by considering the ‘end’ times, and then outlines how God had appointed times of wrath which would come upon those who did not follow his decrees. Then the writer begins with an exhortation that is identical to CD 1:1. In 4Q268 the word אל appears in palaeo-Hebrew script. Wacholder (2007:144) believes that the reference to the remnant here is future and points to the coming messianic age, but I prefer the traditional view which considers this document to refer mainly to the past.

³⁴⁶ So with Baumgarten & Schwartz (1995:13) who suggest that ‘first ones’ ‘here refers to Israel’s ancestors,’ though elsewhere ‘it refers to the members of the first covenant (3:10) or to the first members of the New Covenant (4:8-10).’ Murphy-O’Connor (1971a:225) notes that the expression הראשונים is ‘a global designation of the pre-Exilic generations.’ Wacholder (2007:27) translates ‘covenant of the ancestral generations.’

³⁴⁷ See also Exodus 6:5; Psalm 105:8-9 where the reference is to God’s remembering his covenant with Abraham (and Isaac). Elsewhere God remembers his covenant in Leviticus 26:42, Ezekiel 16:60 and Psalm 106:45, but there the reference is to the Sinai covenant (cf. Schwarz 1965:4). Grossman (2002:111) thinks that perhaps even the Noahic covenant is included. This is possible, but Noah’s covenant is never explicitly referred to in CD, and since the covenant with Noah is universal rather than with the Jewish people it is perhaps less likely.

with Baumgarten & Schwartz (1995:13, n. 3) conclude that the covenant in CD 1:4 is that with Israel's ancestors, presumably Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.³⁴⁸

However, one could also argue that at CD 1:4 the Mosaic covenant is in view since the writer explains how God delivered the people up to the sword which is one of the covenant curses mentioned in Leviticus 26:25 and Deuteronomy 28:22. Moreover, Leviticus 26:40-45 contains God's promises after a whole list of curses for covenant unfaithfulness. God says that if the people in exile confess their sins and return to God, he will remember his 'covenant with Jacob, ... Isaac, ... and Abraham' (Lv 26:40ff; the quote is from v. 42). God will not 'destroy them utterly' (לְכַלְתָּם; Lv 26:44; cf. also Neh 9:30-31), but he will certainly remember his covenant with their forefathers (בְּרִית רְאִשְׁוֹתָם; Lv 26:45) when he led them out of Egypt (Lv 26:45). Here the same terminology is used as in CD 1:4: בְּרִית רְאִשְׁוֹתָם, and it is connected to the exodus from Egypt. In view of this exact verbal correspondence, it is likely that the writer of CD had this text in mind and referred to the Exodus when he penned these lines. However, he applied it to the return from exile in the subsequent lines.³⁴⁹ Nevertheless, perhaps one should not be too dogmatic as the Mosaic covenant is an extension of the covenant with the ancestors, and since Leviticus also explicitly refers to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Davies (1982a:213, n. 23) similarly states that it really does not matter whether this covenant was 'first made with Noah, Abraham or Moses,' since the writer of CD only seems to have known of 'one "first" covenant, the one which ended at the exile.' Stegemann (1971:A112, n. 521) shrewdly observes that in CD appositional (ה)רְאִשְׁוֹתָם never refers to the Qumran sect or its precursors, but to God's covenant with all Israel as manifest in the Torah.

The writer of CD continues to state that God not only left a remnant for Israel,³⁵⁰ he even caused this remnant to prosper during their captivity, and 'he took care of them and

³⁴⁸ De Roo (2003:194) notes that in 'rabbinic literature we find many clear examples of the notion that God keeps his covenant and shows mercy to his people for the sake of the obedience of the forefathers,' and adds that 'this notion about the covenant was already present during the Second Temple period' in such writings as *2 Baruch*, Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*, the *Testament of Levi* and the Prayer of Manasseh. She goes on to argue that the *Akedah* (binding) of Isaac by Abraham (Gn 22) 'was thought of as having an atoning function for the sins of the Israelites' (De Roo 2003:202) at least from the early 'first century AD' onwards, if not earlier. In fact, 'Grace played a crucial role in merit theology, because God graciously allowed the good deeds of some to be salvific for others due to their membership in the same covenant.' Perhaps the seeds of this theology are already reflected in CD here and elsewhere where the document refers to the 'covenant of the forefathers.' Freedman & Miano (2003:12) similarly remark that 'the eternal nature of the unconditional covenant [with Abraham] ... would seem to be the basis for belief in the renewability of the conditional, obligatory covenant(s).'

³⁴⁹ Rabinowitz (1954:12-13, n. 5) states that the historical reference in CD 1:4, especially the reference to the 'sword,' is to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple. Davies (1982a:213, n. 23) observes that 'the Exodus is not an occasion of the (new) covenant, but an outcome of the old (patriarchal) one. The importance of this allusion in the context of the Holiness Code is that the Exodus is portrayed as the prototype of another event – the leading out of exile – which will also be in remembrance of this same original covenant.'

³⁵⁰ Rabinowitz (1954:13, n. 6) suggests that the writer here refers to the remnant that 'went into captivity in "the land of Damascus"' and were [later] restored.' He also notes the connection to Leviticus 26, among a number of other

caused to grow from Israel and from Aaron a root of planting' (CD 1:7). This is reminiscent of the promise to Israel in Isaiah 11:1,³⁵¹ 10-11³⁵² though slightly different terminology is used there, and CD apparently identifies this 'root of planting' with a community (Israel and Aaron)³⁵³ rather than an individual, as Isaiah does.³⁵⁴ The idea that God ultimately fulfils his covenant promises after judgment has run its course shines through both CD and the Isaiah verses which have a messianic connotation that also appears to be reflected in CD 1:11ff where the author speaks about the Teacher of Righteousness.³⁵⁵ Though it is perhaps somewhat far-fetched to consider the Teacher a messianic figure,³⁵⁶ he has the qualities of insight and understanding that are also the characteristics of the 'Branch of Jesse'³⁵⁷ of whom Isaiah speaks in such lofty terms (Is 11:2). Wacholder (2007:27), unlike other interpreters, translates CD 1:4 onwards as future tense. Moreover, instead of seeing here a reference to Isaiah, he believes that the phrase *ויצמח מישראל* 'must be read as the Ezekielian promise of a transformed land' (Wacholder 2007:146; cf. Ezk 47). This is of course possible, but I think that the verbal connotation points rather to Isaiah.

CD 1:8-10 is reminiscent of the prayer of Daniel 9,³⁵⁸ since we are told that the people 'knew that they were guilty men' (DSSEL; *ידעו כי אנשים אשימים הם*) and 'sought' God 'with a whole heart'³⁵⁹ (DSSEL; *כי בלב שלם דרשוהו*), just as Daniel did in that prayer. As a result, God raised up for them the Teacher of Righteousness who taught (*ויודע*) them God's way (CD 1:11). The teaching consisted of showing the people who associated with

scriptures. Hultgren (2007:111) observes that the writer of CD understood that 'God remains true to his covenant by raising up a chosen remnant who "enter the covenant" to seek him and to return to him.'

³⁵¹ 'A shoot will come up from the stump of Jesse, from his roots a Branch will bear fruit' (NIV).

³⁵² 'In that day the Root of Jesse will stand as a banner for the peoples; the nations will rally to him and his place of rest will be glorious. In that day, the Lord will reach out his hand a second time to reclaim the remnant that is left of his people from Assyria, from Lower Egypt, from Upper Egypt, from Cush, from Elam, from Babylonia, from Hamath and from the islands of the sea' (NIV).

³⁵³ Davies (1982a:65) observes that 'in CD the terms "Aaron" and "Israel" jointly designate the whole community.'

³⁵⁴ Hultgren (2007:229) specifies this further. He believes that 'the remnant of I,4 are the survivors of the exile ... whereas the "root" of I,7 is a particular subset of the "remnant," namely, the Damascus covenant itself' (Hultgren 2007:229). As a result, he dates the rise of the community that formed the 'new covenant in the land of Damascus' to 'much earlier than 175 BC' (Hultgren 2007:229), contra Stegemann (1971:242ff), who dates the appearance of the Teacher of Righteousness to about 153/152 BCE and thus the origin of the community to about 171/2 BCE (Stegemann 1971:242).

³⁵⁵ Who the Teacher of Righteousness was has been the subject of a longstanding debate. Most scholars believe that the Teacher and his adversary, the Wicked Priest or Man of the Lie, were historical figures (e.g. Collins 2010a:38), but that is where the consensus ends. Many believe he founded the sect that was to be identified with the Qumran sectarians, based on the present text in CD (cf. Wacholder 1999) and 4Q171 (4QPs^a 1-10) 3:14-17 (cf. VanderKam & Flint 2002:282) where it is also stated he was a priest. Wacholder (1999; 1999-2000) however suggests that the Teacher is an eschatological figure. The issue is too complex to discuss further in this work.

³⁵⁶ Unfortunately, further discussion on this topic is beyond the scope of this work.

³⁵⁷ Boyce (1990:621) also mentions the 'root of Jesse' in connection with this line.

³⁵⁸ As well as other similar prayers, e.g. Nehemiah 1:5-11; 9:1-37.

³⁵⁹ The references to 390 years of punishment in CD 1:6 and 20 years of groping in CD 1:10 are often considered interpolations. However, since the words '390' are also explicit in 4Q268 1:13, at least this reference seems to be authentic. This number seems to go back to Ezekiel 4:5, interpreted as a time of sin, not the duration of Israel's exile (cf. Rabinowitz 1954:13-14, n. 8). The 20 years are less certain to identify. Rabinowitz (1954:15, n. 11) thinks they may be based on Nehemiah 1:1. This is of course possible but perhaps less likely.

the Teacher how the nation had failed to walk in God's way and thus had become 'traitors,' men who 'depart from the Way' (CD 1:12-13, Baumgarten & Schwartz 1995:13). The writer then mentions for the first time the Teacher's adversary, called the 'Man of Mockery' (DSSEL; איש הלצון) or 'the Scoffer' (DSSSE), who arose³⁶⁰ and led the people of God astray, away from 'paths of righteousness' (CD 1:16) and into rebellion (CD 1:13-15, quoting from Hs 4:16 and Ps 107:40; Jb 12:24), which manifested itself as the moving of 'the ancient boundary stones' (cf. Dt 19:14). This is later interpreted figuratively as the seeking of 'flattery' (חלקות; CD 1:18, DSSEL; DSSSE 'easy interpretations'), 'deceit' (מהתלות; CD 1:18³⁶¹) and 'loopholes' (see below).

As a result of their deliberate waywardness, God brought upon Israel 'the curses of his covenant' (אלות בריתו; cf. Dt 29:20 [Eng. v. 21]; CD 1:17//4Q266 2i:20, DSSEL, reconstructed). These are described more significantly as the 'sword of vengeance, the vengeance of the covenant' (לחרב נקמת נקם ברית; CD 1:17-18; parallel 4Q266 2i:21, DSSEL, reconstructed). The reference to Deuteronomy is significant, since the expression אלות הברית there, as here in CD, is in the context of an admonition against the deliberate refusal to heed the warning God gives to his people not to stray from his laws, especially those regarding punishments for idolatry. The expression לחרב נקמת נקם ברית is yet another quote from Leviticus 26:25 (חָרַב נִקְמַת נִקְמַת-בְּרִית), also in the context of covenant curses. The threat in Leviticus comes after the fourth and last repetition of the 'seven times more' punishment God promises the people if they refuse to heed his disciplinary measures, and thus points to the same deliberate refusal of God as Deuteronomy 29:18ff.³⁶² In other words, the writer apparently refers back to the happenings during the last few decades before the fall of Jerusalem and its destruction and the exile of the people.

The writer of CD continues by noting how the Israelites had transgressed³⁶³ and violated the covenant (CD 1:20; ויעבירו ברית ויפירו חוק;³⁶⁴ parallel 4Q266 2i:23, DSSEL, reconstructed), apparently a reference to the Mosaic laws. In particular they had refused to live according to its strict rules, but tried to find all kinds of 'loopholes' (DSSSE CD 1:18-19; ויצפו לפרצות lit. 'look out for gaps'), which resulted in a number of social evils, especially corruption in court³⁶⁵ and the persecution of those who wished to live righteous

³⁶⁰ בעמוד; the same verb that is used in Daniel 11 to describe the appearance of the different kings of the South and North.

³⁶¹ Cf. Isaiah 30:10 where the word is used for false prophecies people want to hear rather than Isaiah's messages of doom.

³⁶² This kind of intentional sin against God is of course also what Daniel confesses in his prayer in Daniel 9.

³⁶³ Note that here CD uses עבר in the sense of 'transgress' the covenant.

³⁶⁴ Cf. Leviticus 26:15: לִהְפָּרֵם אֶת-בְּרִיתִי, 'they broke my covenant;' 2 Kings 18:12: וַיַּעֲבֹר אֶת-בְּרִיתוֹ אֶת כָּל-אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה מֹשֶׁה, 'but they transgressed his covenant, everything that Moses commanded.'

³⁶⁵ 'They declared the guilty righteous, and the righteous guilty;' ויצדיקו רשע וירשיעו צדיק (CD 1:19).

lives before God (CD 1:19f).³⁶⁶ God therefore was angry with them and brought the covenant curses (outlined in Lv 26 and Dt 28, but not explicitly quoted here) on them by destroying ‘their whole multitude’ (להשם את כל המונם; CD 2:1).

3.2.2.2 CD 2:2

CD 2:2 starts almost in the same way as 1:1: *ועתה שמעו אלי כל באי ברית ואגלה אזנכם* (‘And now, listen to me, all [you] who enter the covenant and I will open your ears...;’ my translation). The writer uses the past history of Israel which he has just retold to exhort his fellows (or possibly new members), the *באי ברית* (CD 2:2; lit. ‘those who enter [the] covenant’; parallel 4Q266 2ii:3, DSSEL, reconstructed), to listen to him so that they may understand the deceitfulness of the wicked people (2:2). The expression *באי ברית*, which is ‘essentially synonymous’ with *יודעי צדק* (CD 1:1; Wacholder 2007:173), does not occur in the MT. In fact, the word *בוא* with the sense of ‘entering a covenant’ only occurs rarely in the HB (5x), mainly in later books, but is quite common in the DSS where the two words occur together twenty-seven times (see the excursus below). In contrast to this scarcity in the HB, the writer of CD is particularly fond of the phrase *באי ברית* which he uses six times with slight variations,³⁶⁷ but other forms of *בוא* also occur.³⁶⁸

3.2.2.3 Excursus: *בוא* in Connection with *בְּרִית* in the HB and in CD

The Hebrew word *בוא* is used for entering a covenant only in Jeremiah 34:10, Ezekiel 16:8 and 2 Chronicles 15:12 (Qal) as well as in 1 Samuel 20:8 and Ezekiel 20:37 (Hiphil), in other words in relatively late texts. The two occurrences in the Hiphil stem will be discussed first.

In 1 Samuel 20:8 David speaks to Jonathan, saying that Jonathan had ‘brought’ him (Hiphil pf 2ms) into a covenant of the Lord with himself (*כִּי בְּבְרִית יְהוָה הֵבִאתָ אֶת-עַבְדְּךָ עִמָּךְ*), and therefore Jonathan should deal kindly with him even though his father was not kindly disposed towards David. In this verse the Hiphil is used with the causative sense.

³⁶⁶ The life of Jeremiah comes to mind. The phrase *להשם את כל המונם* is reminiscent of such verses as Jeremiah 12:11 (*שָׁמָּה לְשִׁמְמָה אָבְלָה עָלַי שְׁמָמָה נִשְׁמָה כָּל-הָאָרֶץ*): ‘It has been made a desolation; desolate, it mourns before me; the whole land has been made desolate;’ NASB). Cf. also Leviticus 26:21, 31-32, 34-35, 43; Daniel 9:18; for similar descriptions of the desolation of the land and the description of the ‘abomination that causes desolation’ (NIV) in Daniel 9:26-27; 11:31; 12:11.

³⁶⁷ E.g. with definite article on *ברית* or a preposition on *בוא*; the occurrences are CD 2:2; 3:10; 4:19; 8:1; 8:14; 20:25. The translator of CD in DSSEL translates the phrase *באי ברית* consistently as ‘members of the covenant.’ Davies (1982a:72) remarks that ‘the identity of the audience addressed in [CD 2:1-13] ... depends on whether the phrase *באי ברית* means “entering the covenant” or “members of the covenant.”’ He does not give his own opinion.

³⁶⁸ See below. In addition, the expression occurs (with slight variations) also at 4Q266 (4QD^a) 2ii:2; 4Q267 (4QD^b) 3:2 and 9iv:11; 4Q269 (4QD^d) 2:5; 4Q270 (4QD^e) 6iii:17.

In Ezekiel 20:37 God speaks to Israel who are going to be taken into captivity and will thus be judged by him, but there they will be brought ‘into the bond of the covenant’ (וְהִבֵּאתִי אֶתְכֶם בְּמִסְכַּרְתַּת הַבְּרִית), Hiphil pf 1cs) by Yahweh to be purged from those unwilling to follow him. Here too the Hiphil simply identifies the verb as a causative form. Thus the ‘bringing into a covenant’ can be done either by a human party where one (probably higher standing) person initiates a covenant with another, or by God, who initiates the covenant with a human being. The lower standing human party is the recipient of the initiative by the higher standing person or God.

The verb בוא occurs three times in the Qal in the active sense of ‘entering a covenant,’ all in relatively late texts. The initiative can be taken either by God (Ezk 16:18) who brings humans into covenant with him or by humans (Jr 34:10, 2 Chr 15:12) who express the desire to enter into a covenant with God. Ezekiel 16:8 appears in a context where Yahweh (the initiator) through Ezekiel tells Jerusalem (metonymy for God’s people, the human recipient) of his choice of her when he made an oath and ‘entered into a covenant with’³⁶⁹ her so that she would become his (וְאֶשְׁבַּע לָךְ וְאָבִוּא בְּבְרִית אִתְּךָ גַּאֲם אֶדְגְּנִי יְהוָה) (וְתִהְיִי לִי). However, Jerusalem had become unfaithful to him by prostituting herself to other nations.

Jeremiah 34:10 notes that Jerusalem’s officials (the human initiator) had ‘entered the covenant’³⁷⁰ (בָּאוּ בְּבְרִית) to release all slaves (the human recipients), but subsequently took back their word and enslaved them again, whereupon the Lord pronounced judgment on the nation. The definite article shows that the purpose of the covenant was particular and referred to something very specific, namely releasing slaves.

A similar expression (i.e. בוא plus בְּבְרִית) is used in 2 Chronicles 15:12, in the context of the story of Asa’s reforms. After a prophecy by the prophet Azariah, Asa ‘took courage’ and began a religious reform programme, in the course of which he removed idols from the land, restored the apparently broken altar of the Lord in front of the temple, and with those who supported his reforms ‘entered’³⁷¹ into the covenant to seek the Lord God of their fathers with all their heart and soul’ (וַיָּבֹאוּ בְּבְרִית לַדְּרוֹשׁ אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵיהֶם) (בְּכָל־לֵבָבָם וּבְכָל־נַפְשָׁם). On the other hand, all those who refused to join them were threatened with the death penalty (2 Chr 15:13). The result of this covenant was that God answered their sincere plea ‘and he was found by them’ (2 Chr 15:15). Here Asa, the king, and the people who supported him were the initiators. Their desire ‘to seek the Lord ... with all

³⁶⁹ Qal impf 1cs 1-consecutive.

³⁷⁰ Qal pf 3cs בוא; n fs ברית + def art.

³⁷¹ Qal impf 3cp בוא + 1-consecutive.

their heart' was the purpose of the covenant. The recipient seems at first sight to be God himself, but in fact ultimately it is human beings who are receiving the blessings of the restored relationship with God. This is the only occurrence in the HB where the expression 'enter a covenant' is used together with 'to seek the Lord ... with all their heart.'

Hultgren (2007:79) suggests that there is a striking correlation between 2 Chronicles 15:1-15 (the covenant renewal ceremony initiated by king Asa) and CD. The ceremony in 2 Chronicles takes place in the third month (of Asa's fifteenth year) and 'can be viewed as a kind of covenant renewal' (Hultgren 2007:79). Similarly, 4Q266 11:17 (cf. 4Q270 7ii:11) mentions a covenant renewal that takes place in the third month. Hultgren (2007:79) finds some 'striking' verbal similarity between 4Q266/4Q270 and 2 Chronicles, but that is in my opinion an overstatement. There are only two similarities: all three texts speak of a ceremony taking place in the third month, and all note some punishment for those who refuse to abide by the covenant; however, they are to be put to death in 2 Chronicles 15:13, but only cursed in 4Q266 11:17/4Q270 7ii 11:12.³⁷² Elsewhere, of course, one finds a number of points of contact between the Damascus covenant and 2 Chronicles 15, e.g. 'returning' (שׁוּב) to God and/or his law (e.g. CD 2:5/2 Chr 15:4), and seeking (דָּרַשׁ) him/it wholeheartedly (e.g. CD 1:10/2 Chr 15:12).

Hultgren is on stronger ground in his observation that there are connections to Deuteronomy (esp. Dt 4:25-31; 29; and 30:1-5; Hultgren 2007:81-84). He takes up Cholewinski's (1985) suggestion that the Moab covenant of Deuteronomy 29-30 is connected to the idea of a new covenant. Cholewinski (1985:110-111) had argued that Jeremiah's (and probably also Ezekiel's) idea of a 'new covenant' goes back to Deuteronomistic redactors who in this way wanted to give 'the prophetic "new covenant" Mosaic roots' (cf. Hultgren 2007:86, summarising Cholewinski 1985:108-111).³⁷³ Though I do not agree with this late dating of the final redaction of Deuteronomy, I think Hultgren (2007:88) may well be right in assuming that Deuteronomy may be the foundation for 'the idea of "entering the new covenant in the land of Damascus" that appears in CD.'³⁷⁴

³⁷² Jubilees also specifies a covenant renewal ceremony taking place on the 15th day that falls into the Festival of Weeks' or the 'Festival of Oaths.' The book of Jubilees makes use of a pun between the words 'weeks' and 'oaths' in Hebrew (Hultgren 2007:79-80). The texts Hultgren (2007:79) cites are, however, concerned with Noah and Abraham, not Asa.

³⁷³ Hultgren (2007:88) believes that the Deuteronomists at least 'reshaped [the Moab covenant] in light of the prophetic concept of the new covenant,' though one may equally well argue that Jeremiah's prediction was an original revelation of God that was also in line with Deuteronomistic theology. Hultgren (2007:87-88) also holds that the final redaction of Deuteronomy comes from 'the exilic or even post-exilic' period. As far as he is concerned, there is a development 'within Deuteronomistic circles in the exilic or post-exilic period, of the idea of "entrance into a covenant" (cf. Deut 29:11), a covenant that has theological affinities to the "new covenant" of the prophets, including that of Jeremiah 31:31-31' (Hultgren 2007:88). It must be noted, however, that the verb for 'entering' the covenant in Deuteronomy 29:11 is *בוּא*, not *עָבַר*.

³⁷⁴ Hultgren (2007:88ff) continues to outline the connection between the Deuteronomy texts and the preaching of the prophets to the exiles where the theme of God's returning the exiles to their land after purging them from their

Hultgren (2007:95) effectively argues that the ‘new covenant in the land of Damascus’ and Asa’s covenant in 2 Chronicles 15 are structurally identical, and since the latter has its roots in Deuteronomistic “‘new covenant’ traditions,’ so does the former. The ‘new covenant in the land of Damascus’ is based on the idea that in order to be ‘restored to its land’ Israel ‘must enter into a covenant to seek God’ wholeheartedly and ‘to study the law and the prophets to find the “hidden things”’ of the law (Hultgren 2007:104). It is in close relationship to Jeremiah’s covenant, and ‘would arise while Israel was in the “land of the north,” that is, Damascus, where, according to Amos 5:26-27, God would deport the law and the prophets’ but also ‘re-establish them and reveal their correct interpretation’ (Hultgren 2007:104). This theme will be further explored in the excursus below on ‘The use of the expression “the new covenant in the land of Damascus” in CD.’

As for the remainder of occurrences in CD, בוא together with ברית occurs thirteen times;³⁷⁵ plus ten times in the Qumran fragments,³⁷⁶ though mainly in reconstructed texts. The most common expression is באי (ה)ברית, ‘those who entered the covenant,’ which appears six times in CD and five times in the 4Q fragments.³⁷⁷

In CD 2:2 (cf. 4Q266 (4QD^a) 2ii:2) the writer calls upon the באי ברית to pay attention to his teachings, in particular his teachings about ‘the wicked’ who rebel against God and refuse to follow his way (CD 2:6). From the context it is obvious that the covenant in view is that of joining the community of the writer, and the wicked are those who do not follow the strict interpretation of the law that his community endorsed. In the context of CD 3:10 (cf. 4Q269 (4QD^d) 2:5) the expression באי הברית הראשנים indicates that the writer here refers to the exodus generation that was judged by God because of their disobedience to the covenant and God’s instructions regarding entry into Canaan.

The reference in CD 6:19 includes the expression ‘new covenant in the land of Damascus.’ The whole phrase ‘according to what was found/discovered by those who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus’ (כמצאת באי הברית החדשה בארץ דמשק) refers to the members of the community of this Damascus covenant, which is, arguably, a community preceding that of the present addressees.

idolatry is prominent. He points out that texts such as Ezekiel 20 and Jeremiah 29 are reminiscent of Deuteronomy 30:3-5 (Hultgren 2007:91). However, the idea of purging and restoring Israel is already latent in Amos 9 and Hosea 2:14-3:5. Both prophets generally prophesy judgment on the nation, but they also promise that after judgment has taken place, God will restore her to himself, Hosea by noting that God will lead Israel into the desert to woo her back (cf. Ezk 20:35 and Hs 2:14). Furthermore, Amos 5 calls on Israel repeatedly to seek (דרש) the Lord so they may live. This language is then taken up more forcefully by the exilic prophets.

³⁷⁵ CD 2:2; 3:10; 6:11, 19; 8:1, 21; 9:3; 12:11; 13:14; 15:5; 19:13, 16, 33; 20:24.

³⁷⁶ 4Q266 (4QD^a) 2ii:2; 3ii:18; 3iii:24; 4Q267 (4QD^b) 3:3; 9iv:11; 4Q269 (4QD^d) 2:5; 9:4; 4Q270 (4QD^e) 5:17; 6i:21; 6iii:17.

³⁷⁷ 4Q266 (4QD^a) 2ii:2; 4Q267 (4QD^b) 3:2 and 9iv:11; 4Q269 (4QD^d) 2:5; 4Q270 (4QD^e) 6iii:17.

CD 8:1 (cf. 4Q266 (4QD^a) 3iii:24 where the expression used is באים בבר[ני]תו; also 4Q267 (4QD^b) 9iv:11) condemns those of the באי הברית who refuse to live by the rules of the community but continue in their old ways, and the same can be said about the occurrences at CD 19:13-14 (באי בריתו, those who entered his covenant) and CD 8:21, which comes after a number of warnings against apostasy. This occurrence incidentally also includes a reference to the ‘new covenant in the land of Damascus’ and is therefore dealt with in more detail below under that heading. The reference in CD 13:14 forbids members of the writer’s community (באי ברית) to ‘buy or sell to corrupt people³⁷⁸ except hand to hand’ (CD 13:14-15; DSSEL).

In CD 6:11 (cf. 4Q266 (4QD^a) 3ii:18) the writer refers to those ‘who have been brought into the covenant’ (הובאו בברית)³⁷⁹ who are to join in boycotting the Jerusalem temple (lit. ‘the sanctuary,’ המקדש). Here the reference is obviously to community members, perhaps ones only recently admitted. CD 9:2-3 (cf. 4Q270 (4QD^e) 6iii:17) denounces present addressees who continue to hold grudges against fellow members. The expression used is מביאו הברית (Hiph pt ms cons + 3ms, ‘those who are brought into the covenant’), which is generally emended to מבאי הברית (Qal pt mp cons), ‘those who enter into the covenant.’

CD 12:11 forbids members of the community to sell property or slaves to gentiles, lest they be used to sacrifice to pagan gods. The slaves are said to ‘have entered with him into Abraham’s covenant,’ אשר באו עמו בברית אברהם, but the reference is obviously to fellow community members, albeit slaves. In CD 15:5 (cf. 4Q270 (4QD^e) 6i:21) ‘he who has entered the covenant’ community (והבא בברית, Qal pt ms def art ו-conj) must also ensure that his children join it when they come of age. CD 19:16 denounces members of the community who have ‘entered the covenant of returning [to God],’ (for this translation see above; באו בברית תשובה, Qal pf 3cp), but refuse to leave their old ways. Such people, according to CD 19:33 (באו בברית החדשה בארץ דמשק, Qal pf 3cp) and context, will face God’s judgment. In fact, according to CD 20:25 (cf. 4Q267 (4QD^b) 3:2), people who have been brought into the covenant (מבאי הברית)³⁸⁰ but who break the law will be expelled from the camp when God’s glory will appear, which is possibly but not necessarily a reference to eschatological punishment.

What is evident from all these occurrences in CD is the fact that, no matter what verbal stem is used, the expression בוא ברית always refers to human effort at entering the

³⁷⁸ בני השחר. These are obviously outsiders, with whom barter trade (rather than cash trade) is permitted (Wacholder 2007:347).

³⁷⁹ Hoph pf 3cp.

³⁸⁰ Hiph pt mp.

covenant. With the possible exception of the reference to the exodus generation in CD 3:10, all the references imply the covenant by the community members who swore to live by the Mosaic Law according to the strict interpretation of the sect. Except for two biblical references, there is no mention of God bringing others into a covenant or entering it.

It is interesting that CD only uses the word כרת for making a covenant three times,³⁸¹ in CD 15:8 (cf. 4Q271 (4QD^f) 4i:11), though it is a common term in the HB. At CD 15:8-9 the writer refers to a covenant that Moses made with Israel. Perhaps the expression had fallen out of use by the time CD was written. But it may be that כרת was considered by the sectarians to refer only to God's first initiative to make a covenant with humans in biblical times. Since they inherited these covenants, as it were, they were merely 'entering into' what had already been established in the past, requiring the use of a different term. This would incidentally also explain the use of בוא in later biblical texts. Moreover, perhaps כרת included the connotation of a sacrificial element in making a covenant which was no longer applicable to the CD community.

The expression קום ברית (either in the Qal or Hiphil stems) for establishing or entering a covenant is used four times in CD (three times in CD, once in 4Q266 3i:3) and six times in S (twice in 1QS, once in a reconstructed lacuna in 1QS^b, twice in 4Q258 and once in 4Q259). It also appears twice in the War Scroll (1QM 13:7 and 4Q491 (4QM^a) 7:1), and three more times in other fragments. At CD 3:13 it is stated that 'God established his covenant with Israel forever' by revealing the 'hidden' things to them. In CD 4:9 (= 4Q266 3i:3) it is reported that 'like the covenant which God established with the forefathers to atone for their sins, so he will atone for them,' (i.e. the members of the writer's community). In CD 20:10 the reference is to recalcitrant members of the writer's community who 'rejected the covenant and agreement which they established in the land of Damascus, i.e. the new covenant,' and who will thus be judged. CD prefers the expression בוא ברית to say that a covenant 'has been entered into.' As noted, it is usually human beings who enter the covenant, generally that of keeping the Mosaic law according to the strict interpretation of the writer's community. Occasionally it is stated that 'God entered' or 'established' a covenant with his people.

3.2.2.4 CD 2:3-4:5

In CD 2:3ff the writer highlights what the 'wicked' have done, but he first shows his readers the greatness of God, who 'loves knowledge [and] wisdom' and is in fact the one

³⁸¹ Five times, if 4QD271 4i:11, 4ii:2-3 are counted as well. The term also appears three times in the Temple Scroll (11Q19 (Temple^a) 2:4, 12; 29:10; twice in the War Scroll (1QM 13:7 and 4Q491 (4QM^a) 7:1; and ten times elsewhere. Most occurrences are references to covenants made with either Moses or Abraham, i.e. in contexts where Scripture is in view.

who bestows these characteristics (CD 2:3). God forgives those who repent, but those who refuse to do so and instead continue in the stubbornness of their hearts will be judged by him (CD 2:4-6). Once more, the writer notes how the Israelites of old refused to obey God and as a result had faced their punishment (CD 2:6-10). God knew all this beforehand, of course, but he always left himself a remnant (lit. ‘those who escape,’ פליתה, CD 2:11), who would not be destroyed with the rest, with whom he could begin afresh, and whom he could teach ‘through his anointed one <the anointed ones> of his spirit, the seers of truth’³⁸² (CD 2:12-13).

Yet another exhortation follows in CD 2:14.³⁸³ The writer urges the members of his community (lit. ‘sons’) to pay attention to him so that he can teach them to choose what pleases God (CD 2:15) and to refrain from what he hates. He encourages his readers not to be like others, including the ‘watchers’ and Noah’s descendants, who fell (CD 2:17-3:1) because they preferred to follow ‘the thoughts of a guilty inclination and lascivious eyes’ (CD 2:16, DSSSE). As a result, they all ‘were cut off’ (CD 2:16), the reference obviously being to the flood. In contrast to them, Abraham kept God’s commandments (CD 3:2) and passed them on to his son Isaac and grandson Jacob, and as a result all three of them were considered ‘friends of God’ (CD 3:3-4, אוהבים לאל) and ‘owners/partners of the covenant forever’ (my translation, בעלי ברית לעולם; parallel 4Q266 2ii:23, DSSEL, reconstructed³⁸⁴). בעלי ברית (CD 3:4) is a unique expression which does not occur in the HB, but in the present text it is apparently synonymous with ‘friends of God’ (or, more literally, ‘lovers to/of God,’ אוהבים לאל). A similar phrase occurs in Isaiah 41:8 where God addresses Israel as his ‘servant,’ Jacob, his ‘chosen one,’ ‘descendant of Abraham, my friend’ (אַבְרָהָם אֱהָבִי; cf. also 2 Chr 20:7, אַבְרָהָם אֱהָבִי; Js 2:23). These OT texts may well have been in the writer’s mind when he penned these lines. The author seems to imply that the initial Abrahamic covenant was considered eternally valid.

³⁸² ויודיעם ביד משיחו <משיחו> רוח קדשו וחזוי אמת. If משיחו here refers to the Teacher of Righteousness, then it is not so far off, after all, to consider him a messianic figure. Davies (1982a:75) thinks it refers to the prophets, which is perhaps more likely.

³⁸³ Murphy-O’Connor (1970) believes that CD 2:14-4:1 originally was a missionary document ‘conceived as an instrument of conversion’ which later was ‘adapted to serve a different function by the addition of historical (I, 1-II, 1) and theological (II, 2-13) introductions.’ I am looking at the whole of CD as it stands where that purpose is less obvious (if at all). I think he overstates the significance of the address: ועתה בנים שמעו לי ואגלה עיניכם. Murphy-O’Connor (1970:204) believes that the use of the ‘banal term “children”’ is ‘entirely neutral in an environment where the communication of knowledge was considered to establish a father-son relationship.’ He thinks that nothing here indicates that the same people are addressed as in the previous two sections, but I beg to differ. The address here also begins with the word ועתה and after addressing the ‘children’ continues with the injunction to ‘hear’ and the statement that the writer ‘will open your eyes,’ just as at 2:2 he had said he would ‘open your ears.’ The clause ועתה בנים שמעו לי recalls Proverbs 5:7, 7:24 and 8:32 (cf. Wacholder 2007:175). As in earlier sections of Proverbs, the address בנים is ‘a term of endearment’ (Wacholder 2007:176), but also, one might add, of an authority figure addressing juniors.

³⁸⁴ This section does not appear in DSSSE; lines 21-24 of 4Q266 2ii are extremely fragmentary, but have been reconstructed by the editor(s) of DSSEL. Baumgarten only gives the preserved sections of these lines in the text, but suggests the restorations in his footnotes (Baumgarten 2006:16, 18, notes 110-116).

The writer continues to outline the history of Israel from Jacob's descendants onwards, noting that they, like the Watchers of the heavens and Noah's descendants before them, went astray and refused to obey God's commandments, starting from their captivity in Egypt and continuing during the wilderness wanderings and the period of the monarchy (only briefly alluded to in line 9). The writer notes in particular the sins of eating blood (CD 3:6) and the people's refusal to go and possess the land (CD 3:7; cf. Nu 13), but the root sin is the 'desire of their spirit' (3:7; lit. simply 'their spirit,' רוחם), i.e. stubbornness (שרירות לבם, 3:5) and wilful disobedience (described in 2:16 as יצר אשמה, 'sinful inclination') which ultimately led not only to the destruction of the wilderness generation, but to the extermination of the monarchy (3:9; ומלכיהם בו³⁸⁵ נכרתו, 'their kings were cut off because of it,' my translation) and the destruction of the land (3:10; וארצם בו שממה, 'their land was devastated because of it,' DSSEL) and the people (3:10-11; ויסגרו לחרב, 'they were handed over to the sword').

All this happened because the 'very first to enter the covenant made themselves guilty' (הבו <חבו> באי הברית הראשנים) CD 3:10, my translation) and thus were punished by God 'because they abandoned the covenant of God' (DSSEL, 3:11; בעזבם את ברית אל; cf. 4Q269 2:4-6), because everyone 'did what he pleased and searched after the stubbornness of his heart'³⁸⁶ (3:11-12; לעשות איש את רצונו ויתורו אחרי שרירות לבם, my translation) instead of doing God's will (3:12; cf. also 2:20-21). The phrase 'very first to enter the covenant' apparently refers to Jacob's descendants in Egypt and the wilderness generation, since the writer has stated that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were 'God's friends.' In other words, the Sinai covenant is meant in both these references in 3:10-11 (cf. Abegg 2003:83), but those who 'abandoned it' ultimately included all the Israelites throughout their history as a nation who refused to abide by it (cf. Murphy-O'Connor 1970:206).

The expression ברית אל³⁸⁷, covenant of God (CD 3:11), appears also in CD 5:12; 7:5; 13:14; 14:2 and 20:17. In CD 3:11 it refers to the Sinai covenant, but the other references are to the sectarian covenant. Together with the term בריתו ('his covenant,' CD 1:17; 3:13; 8:1; 19:3), ברית אל indicates that 'the covenant has its origin in God, in whose nature and will it is grounded, and on whose promise covenant-validity rests' (Christiansen

³⁸⁵ The expression בו ('because of it' or 'by it') in 3:9, 10 apparently refers back to the phrases יצר אשמה (2:16) and שרירות לבם (3:5).

³⁸⁶ This is reminiscent of the kings in Daniel 11 who also did 'as they pleased.'

³⁸⁷ CD, like other DSS, does not like to use God's covenant name, YHWH (on the avoidance of the Tetragrammaton in the DSS cf. Parry 1997:437-449; Stegemann 1978, esp. pp 195-196, 200-202). Instead, it prefers אל (cf. Stegemann 1978:201). It appears that the expression ברית אל is used in a way similar to ברית יהוה, which occurs thirty seven times in the MT (mostly in the expression 'ark of the covenant of the Lord,' ארון ברית יהוה, but a few times by itself, e.g. in Dt 4:23; 29:24; Josh 7:15; 23:16; 1 Ki 8:21//2 Chr 6:11; Jr 22:9). It is interesting that all of these references (with the exception of 1 Ki 8:21//2 Chr 6:11, which refer to the covenant documents that are in the ark) are in the context of either Israel's falling away from God's covenant, or a warning not to do so. Only two of the references to the 'covenant of God' in CD are used in this way.

1998:72). In fact, since the covenants with Noah and Abraham and the Sinai covenant are all instigated by God, one may well argue with Christiansen (1998:72) that the HB conceives of only one, divinely established covenant which was manifested in different ways (cf. Christiansen 1998:72).

CD 3:13 asserts that God established this covenant ‘forever’ *with* (or *for*,³⁸⁸ לִישְׂרָאֵל) those Israelites who were ‘left [and] held firm to the commandments of God’ (DSSEL), including the predecessors of the writer’s community (cf. Holtz 2009:37). Although it seems that this involved the establishment of a ‘new’ covenant (cf. Davies 2010:35), it is better to understand it as the renewal and transformation of the old (Mosaic) one for the present community, analogous to the covenant with the forefathers (CD 4:9).³⁸⁹ The question arises what is meant by the term ‘Israel’ in this context. Holtz (2009:37) thinks that it ‘means Israel as a whole.’ She is right in the sense that potentially all Israelites may repent and join the community (cf. Holtz 2009:39), but one should not see this as a blanket inclusion of each and every Israelite, no matter what their spiritual condition is. As Garcia Martinez (2007:297) points out, ‘[t]he divine covenant is for ever, but now not every Israelite is automatically a member. Only those who are faithful to its precepts are members’ (cf. also Evans 2003:80, who notes that the ‘distinctive feature of Covenant at Qumran is the reduction of the number of elect’). A similar notion is found in Romans 9:6: ‘For not all who are descended from Israel belong to Israel and not all are children of Abraham because they are his offspring’ (ESV). The seeds to these Christian ideas were already present before the Christian era among the DSS sectarians.

In this covenant God ‘revealed to them things hidden, in which all Israel had erred’ (לגלות להם נסתרות אשר תעו בהם כל ישראל; cf. 4Q266 2i:5, 4Q268 1:7). These ‘hidden things’³⁹⁰

³⁸⁸ Holtz (2009:37) points out that the covenant in IQS 3:13 is made ‘for Israel,’ (לִישְׂרָאֵל) not, as in the translations (e.g. DSSEL), ‘with Israel.’ She may have a point here, but it is noteworthy that in the HB the preposition ל in connection with making a covenant ‘for’ someone is primarily used for covenants between a superior and an inferior human party (e.g. Josh 9:6; 1 Sm 11:1; 2 Ki 11:4 etc.). Where God is said to make a covenant with somebody or Israel, the preposition ל is quite rare and first occurs in the prophetic books (and almost always later ones; Is 55:3; Jr 32:40; Ezk 16:60; 34:25, 26; Hs 2:20) and three times in Psalms and Chronicles (Ps 89:3; 105:10; 2 Chr 21:7). It is also interesting that in Ezra 10:3 and Chronicles 29:10, i.e. in post-exilic literature, ל is used in expressions where humans want to make a covenant with God. There seems to be a shift in meaning and an acceptance of ל to indicate ‘make a covenant *with*’ which appears also in the DSS. Therefore I believe one should not make too much of the preposition used in IQS 3:13. The translation ‘he instituted his covenant *with* Israel’ for הִקִּים אֶל אֶת בְּרִיתוֹ לִישְׂרָאֵל does not, I think, mean anything different than if the translation were ‘he instituted his covenant *for* Israel’ (which is more literal).

³⁸⁹ Cf. Nitzan (2001:94); Evans (2003:59); Hultgren (2007:115); Garcia Martinez (2007:297). Schiffman (2004:260; cf. 2010a:238) notes that the text assumes that ‘the laws of the Torah actually predated the Sinaitic revelation, a claim made consistently in Jubilees as well.’ Davies (1982a:81ff) also points out the relationship to Jubilees. Wacholder (2007:110) goes so far as to state that the Damascus Document ‘presents itself as an amplification of the book of *Jubilees*’ or ‘a sequel to *Jubilees*’ (Wacholder 2007:118).

³⁹⁰ Cf. Deuteronomy 29:28. Garcia-Martinez (2010a:235) believes, rightly I think, that the words ‘*nistar*’ (hidden) and ‘*nigleh*’ (revealed) take on a new meaning in the sectarian scrolls ‘since what is hidden from Israel is revealed to them.’ Wacholder (2007:194) thinks that the ‘*nigleh*’ is what he calls the ‘sectarian Torah,’ i.e. for him the ‘*Torah* and *Te’udah* according to *Jubilees*.’ Perhaps one should rather say the Torah as interpreted by them.

are not ‘things not found in Scripture, but ... new truths about what is already in Scripture’ (Evans 2003:60; cf. Collins 2010b:12-13³⁹¹); they are ‘not “new” revelations but radicalized demands, new ways of interpreting the already-existing covenant laws on keeping the Sabbath’ (Christiansen 1998:83) and other issues. In fact, one may well state with Collins (2007a:182) that ‘the *raison d’être* of the new community is the correct interpretation’ (cf. also Evans 2003:55) and ‘observance of the Torah’ (Collins 2010b:5). The issue of proper understanding is of course also an important theme in Daniel, though neither of the terms used here is present in Daniel. Moreover, the revelation in CD is not directly by divine inspiration, as in Daniel (though there sometimes mediated through an angel), but happens through proper exegesis (cf. Davies 1982a:86; Shemesh & Werman 2003:108; García Martínez 2010a:235).

The ‘hidden things’ concerned the failures of the preceding generations with regard to God’s ‘holy Sabbaths, his glorious appointed feasts, his righteous laws and his true/trustworthy ways as well as his pleasing will which man(kind) should do to live by them’ (my translation, CD 3:14-16, שבתות קדשו ומועדי כבודו עידות צדק ודרכי אמתו והפצי רצונו (אשר יעשה האדם והיה בהם). The last part of this text is a quotation of Leviticus 18:5, with the only difference that CD reads והיה whereas MT reads והי (cf. Neh 9:29; Ezk 20:13).³⁹² Both Ezekiel 20:13 and CD 3:14-16 make the point that the commandments issued at Sinai, in particular the detailed stipulations regarding the Jewish feasts and the Sabbath, complement the covenant with the forefathers (i.e. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob).³⁹³

CD 3:16b-18 reports how some of the Israelites ‘dug a well, yielding much water’ (3:16), i.e. they studied God’s commandments and thus became recipients of the special revelation (cf. CD 6:3-9), while others continued in their stubborn refusal of God’s laws. Nevertheless, God in his mysterious grace still ‘forgave their transgression’ (3:17) and ‘built for them a sure house’³⁹⁴ (ויבן להם בית נאמן; 3:18-19, Baumgarten & Schwartz

³⁹¹ Collins (2010b:12) notes that although the sectarians had remained faithful to the covenant, they still ‘did not know all they needed to know from tradition’ (Collins 2010b:13), but needed special revelation. At CD 6:7, the principal recipient of this new revelation is named ‘Interpreter of the Law’ (דורש התורה), a person probably to be equated with the Teacher of Righteousness, especially since CD 6:11 goes on to label him ‘he who teaches righteousness’ (יורה) (הצדק; cf. Collins 2010b:13). For a more detailed discussion on the meaning of ‘hidden’ and ‘revealed’ things and the different interpretations of Dt 29:28 in rabbinic literature see Shemesh & Werman (1998:410-421).

³⁹² Nehemiah 9:29 and Ezekiel 20:13 also mention the rebellion of Israel in the desert. Apart from the exact wording, the context of the reference in CD has fewer similarities with Nehemiah 9 than with Ezekiel 20.

³⁹³ Of course, one of the most important aspects of the theology of the Qumran sect is its insistence on ‘the correct interpretation of the law’ (Collins 2010a:18), in particular the observance of the Jewish festivals according to the correct cultic calendar (cf. Collins 2010a:19), which in CD was based on the 364-day solar year rather than the 354-day lunar year observed in Jerusalem. Collins (2010a:19) notes that ‘Calendrical differences were a major impetus to sectarian formation. If a group did not observe the festivals at the same time as everyone else, then it effectively separated itself from the rest of the people.’ For this theme cf. also Davies (1982a:81ff); Abegg (2003:86f).

³⁹⁴ בית נאמן appears in 1 Samuel 2:35, referring to a priestly dynasty and in 1 Samuel 25:28, 1 Kings 11:38 referring to the Davidic dynasty. A ‘house’ can designate either a dwelling place, the temple or the Davidic dynasty (cf. 2 Sm 7; Christiansen 1998:81). Murphy-O’Connor (1970:209) and Davies (1982a:90; 1982b:290) prefer an allusion to the

1995:17; DSSSE has ‘safe home’), though the people had deliberately spurned God and ‘defiled themselves with human sin and unclean paths’ (3:17, DSSSE). God also ‘swore to them’ in words almost equal to Ezekiel 44:15 (DSSSE, 3:21).³⁹⁵ CD is somewhat shorter, and Ezekiel equates the Zadokites with the Levitical priests (וְהַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִיִּם בְּנֵי צְדוֹק), whereas CD mentions them in addition to them (הַכֹּהֲנִים וְהַלְוִיִּים וּבְנֵי צְדוֹק; ‘the priests *and* the Levites *and* the sons of Zadok;’ Ezk 44:15 does not have the conjunctions). It is also significant that CD 3:21 reads הָקִים אֱלֹהִים לָהֶם, i.e. ‘God swore to/established (a covenant?) for them.’ HALOT gives ‘keep one’s word’ as one of the meanings of קוּם in the Hiphil, which fits the context here. Nevertheless, the use of a term that is often associated with covenant making is suggestive.³⁹⁶

After quoting from Ezekiel, the writer of CD then continues with his *peshet*-like interpretation: ‘The priests are the converts of Israel who left the land of Judah; and [the Levites are] those who joined them; and the sons of Zadok are the chosen of Israel, the men of renown, who stand (to serve) at the end of days (הַעֲמִידִים בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים)’ (DSSSE). Obviously he is referring to his community. Although the writer purports to give a list of their names (CD 4:4-5) he does in fact not do so.³⁹⁷

3.2.2.5 CD 4:6b-19

CD 4:6b begins with a blank, and there seems to be something missing in the text, since the sentence is incomplete.³⁹⁸ Maybe one could paraphrase CD 4:6b-7a ‘The first holy

priesthood for CD 3:19, but perhaps the two should not be considered mutually exclusive. I think Christiansen (1998:81) is right in noting that the word probably indicates ‘a synthesis of a continuation of the Davidic dynasty and of the community of priests serving at the temple (either the real or the spiritualized temple).’ Murphy-O’Connor (1970:209) actually modifies his statement by noting that ‘the reference ... is not to a building but to a community,’ founded by God himself and enjoying ‘his special favour’ (Murphy-O’Connor 1970:209). Similarly also Hultgren (2007:317): ‘Through further reflection on this prophecy, the community came to see itself as the “sure house” of 1 Sam 2:35 (CD 111,19), a temple-community in which faithful Zadokite priests were pre-eminent (CD IV,3-4).’

³⁹⁵ Ezekiel 44:15 reads: ‘But the Levitical priests, the sons of Zadok, who kept charge of My sanctuary when the sons of Israel went astray from Me, shall come near to Me to minister to Me; and they shall stand before Me to offer Me the fat and the blood’ (NASB; BHS וְהַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִיִּם בְּנֵי צְדוֹק אֲשֶׁר שָׁמְרוּ אֶת־מִשְׁמַרְתִּי מִקְדָּשִׁי בְּתַעֲוִת בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵעַלִּי הִנֵּה יִקְרְבוּ אֵלַי וְהַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִיִּים וּבְנֵי צְדוֹק אֲשֶׁר שָׁמְרוּ אֶת־מִשְׁמַרְתִּי מִקְדָּשִׁי בְּתַעֲוִת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵעַלִּי הֵם; CD has: וְהַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִיִּים וּבְנֵי צְדוֹק אֲשֶׁר שָׁמְרוּ אֶת־מִשְׁמַרְתִּי מִקְדָּשִׁי בְּתַעֲוִת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵעַלִּי הֵם; DSSSE).

³⁹⁶ Murphy-O’Connor (1970:210) notes that the ‘combination of the hifil of קוּם with בָּיַד found in the introductory formula (III, 21 a) is attested nowhere else.’

³⁹⁷ Baumgarten & Schwartz (1995:19) note: ‘The text here is in disarray, apparently due to the loss of the promised list. Perhaps it was too long to copy; perhaps its dating of the end of time had already passed.’ Murphy-O’Connor (1970:214) notes that the medieval copyist would have found such a list of ‘little interest’ for his own community, though it was probably necessary for the returning exiles to prove to those having remained in the country that they had indeed a right to speak. Tromp (2007:226) suggests that perhaps a more plausible reason for the missing list of names is that the copy from which CD was made lacked that particular page; this would also explain the incomplete sentence at CD 4:6-7: הקודש שונים אשר כפר אל בעדם (see next note). He rightly argues that if the list had been left out on purpose the copyist would have started with a full sentence (Tromp 2007:226).

³⁹⁸ DSSSE suggests the reading הקודש (הם הראשונים) (lines 6-7; lit. ‘holiness (they are the first ones)’); DSSSE has ‘of holiness «are the forefathers»’; DSSSE however suggests the following reading: [אנשי הקודש הראשונים]; my translation; DSSSE translates: ‘< > holiness < > whom

ones are the ones whom God atoned for.’ This would fit in well with the following text, which continues: ‘and all those who entered (presumably into the covenant; cf. Murphy-O’Connor 1970:215) after them in order to act according to the exact interpretation of the law in which the forefathers were instructed’ (CD 4:7-8, DSSSE, וכל הבאים אחריהם לעשות, כפרוש התורה אשר התוסרו בו הראשנים). The writer obviously has in mind the interpretation of the law according to his own community’s reading. The following lines refer back to this remark, noting that ‘according to the covenant which God established with the forefathers, in order to atone for their iniquities, so will God atone for them’ (CD 4:9-10; כברית אשר בעדם אל הכפר על עונותיהם כן יכפר אל בעדם; cf. 4Q266 3i:3, DSSEL, reconstructed).

It is not quite clear whether the phrase ‘those who entered after them’ refers to the writer’s own time and people (so e.g. Grossman 2002:112) or to the predecessors of the writer’s community (whose direct descendants he and his readers are). Regardless of the exact referent, the covenant envisaged could be either the Abrahamic or the Sinaitic covenant. Murphy-O’Connor (1970:215) suggests, rightly I think, that comparison with CD 3:10b ‘would suggest that these [i.e. the ‘first ones’ or ‘forefathers’] are to be identified with the Mosaic generation understood either in a strict or broad sense.’ He goes on to argue that the clause “‘those who entered (the covenant) after them” (IV, 7b) refers to the post-exilic generations up to the present’ of the writer of CD (Murphy-O’Connor 1970:215).³⁹⁹

CD 4:10b⁴⁰⁰ seems to begin a new section.⁴⁰¹ The writer says that after the completion of the correct number of years there will be no more ‘joining with the house of

God atoned for’). Murphy-O’Connor (1970:215) gives two possibilities: (a) אנשי [הקודש] and (b) הקודש [הראשונים], each supported by a number of scholars. With him I prefer the first option.

³⁹⁹ Christiansen (1998:75) suggests that in CD 4:1-10 there may be an allusion to Malachi 2:8-9 ‘with its twofold understanding of priestly service: to guard knowledge and to give instruction (torah).’ She notes that if this is so, ‘CD acknowledges that it is a priestly task and responsibility to mediate knowledge and to give instruction’ which it then extends ‘into a non-cultic sphere’ (Christiansen 1998:75). Grossman (2002:112) argues that the reference here is ‘to the first ones of the *new* covenant, who serve as a replacement for ... the founding generations of Israel itself.’ Even if this is so, the *new* covenant is still modelled on the Mosaic covenant, according to whose strict interpretation the writer’s community lived.

⁴⁰⁰ Murphy-O’Connor (1970:201, 218) considers this part of CD (in fact all of 2:14-6:1) as a ‘missionary document’, addressed to outsiders whom the writer wants to win over to his community. [He seems to have taken up an idea expressed a little earlier by Iwry (1969:83) who thinks that the whole document ‘was designed first of all as a hortatory missionary work (MS. A).’] This may well be so, but in my opinion there is also the possibility that the writer addresses younger or newer members of the community to exhort them in a way similar to Proverbs 1-9. Especially the address ‘sons’ or ‘children’ in CD 2:14 is reminiscent of Proverbs 4:1 (also 7:24), which in effect starts with exactly the same words: ‘And now sons, listen to me...’ In the context of Proverbs 1-9 the addressee is a young man, more precisely a royal son, who is exhorted to live according to God’s wisdom by his father. The point is that the chapters in Proverbs are addressed primarily to insiders, not outsiders, and I believe that the same is true for CD as a whole, including CD 2:14-6:1, which Murphy-O’Connor considers a missionary tractate addressed to outsiders. The idea of winning outsiders may indeed be present as well but I do not think it was the most important intention of the writer.

⁴⁰¹ Murphy-O’Connor (1970:217) suggests that the phrase ‘house of Judah’ is a reference to the writer’s own community, and that the ‘watchtower’ refers to Habakkuk 2:1 and 1QpHab 7:1, exhorting the readers to ‘perpetual vigilance’ (1970:218). Tromp (2007:227) similarly points out that there is an allusion to Habakkuk here. He notes that the meaning of the first half of the phrase is that ‘once the number of predetermined years is fulfilled, one can

Judah' but that on the contrary 'each one [will be] standing up on his watchtower' (DSSSE) and that 'the wall is built,⁴⁰² the boundary removed' (CD 4:12, DSSSE; cf. Mic 7:11). He seems to look forward to a time when it will no longer be possible for people to join his community. In contrast to that, 'in the present age Belial will be set loose against Israel' (CD 4:12-13, DSSSE). The writer explains this statement by quoting Isaiah 24:17 (פחד ופחת ופח עליך יושב הארץ), which he then continues to expound in pesher-like fashion as referring to three nets of Belial 'with which he catches Israel' (DSSSE, 4:16), i.e. 'fornication ... wealth ... [and] defilement of the temple' (DSSSE, 4:18-19). The writer continues to allude to Hosea 5:11, 'He followed [man's] command' (הִלֵּךְ אַחֲרֵי־צֶוֹ), but interprets צו as a false preacher ('the preacher of whom he said, 'Assuredly they will preach', and those who follow him 'are caught twice in fornication' (CD 4:20, DSSSE).

3.2.2.6 CD 5-8

CD 5 is devoted to outlining the failures of past generations because they were ignorant of the law that was, according to the writer's information, hidden 'since the day of the death of Eleazar and of Jehoshua' until 'Zadok's entry into office' (CD 5:3-5, DSSSE). David himself also sinned in the matter of Uriah the Hittite, but was forgiven. However, the people after him 'defiled the temple, for they did not keep apart in accordance with the law' (CD 5:7-8, DSSSE) but entertained illicit sexual relationships, including incest (more narrowly defined by the sectarians than among other Jewish groups). Not only that, they refused to accept God's laws and statutes, speaking 'slandorously against the statutes of God's covenant' (ובלשון גדופים פתחו פה על חוקי ברית אל), considering them to be 'without basis' and an 'abomination' (לאמר לא נכוננו ותועבה); CD 5:12, my translation). Here the writer moves 'from specific to general' accusations against his opponents, and even quotes their words (Wacholder 2007:208), but the exact meaning of the statement is somewhat obscure. What is the covenant here referred to? The context indicates a *particular interpretation* of some of the Levitical laws (CD 5:7-8), and hence the Mosaic covenant. But did the writer's opponents literally reject the Mosaic covenant (if this is what is meant by covenant)? That seems unlikely. The problem between the sectarians and their enemies

no longer join the community of the covenant.' The whole line is rather difficult to understand. Some scholars think they comprise the end of what has just been said, but I think that Tromp's suggestion that 4:10b actually is the start of the next section makes more sense (Tromp 2007:230).

⁴⁰² Davies (1995:135) notes that the 'wall' is one of the boundaries the community described in CD uses to distinguish itself from the outside world, or, more precisely, 'false Israel.' He says that this is 'apparently a wall separating those to be saved, inside the sect, and those to be annihilated, outside it' (Davies 1995:135). Even more trenchant is the description 'builders of the wall,' which he thinks may be derived from Ezekiel 13:10 and 'which appears in 4:19 and recurs in 19:24-25 and 8:18 (= 19:31)' (Davies 1995:135). He observes that this wall (or boundary) 'was not imposed ... by the sect, but by those outside it, who cut themselves off from the true "Israel" by "following *ṣaw*" (CD 4:19).'

was not the Torah itself, but its interpretation and thus application or *halakhah* (cf. Davies 1982a:109). Therefore it is more probable that the issue here too is the *sectarian interpretation of the Mosaic covenant* (Murphy-O'Connor 1970:222; Davies 1982a:117; Wacholder 2007:210). Obviously this applied first of all to the regulations just listed in CD 5:6-11, but the quotation implies that these are just some examples where the sectarians differ from their opponents. Davies (1982a:117) more narrowly defines the covenant here as that of the sectarians, saying that it is 'more likely that the word בריתה would be reserved for the community's covenant, since in its view no other covenant remained valid, and certainly not for those outside the community.' I would, however, still prefer the view that it is the interpretation of the Mosaic covenant that is at stake,⁴⁰³ though perhaps the difference is more apparent than real.

The writer continues to castigate the enemies of his sect by declaring that anyone who keeps in contact with them is 'unclean' (CD 5:13-15; quoting Is 50:11; 59:5). Moreover, those outside his own community are men without insight (CD 5:16-17, cf. Is 27:11) who are compared to 'Jannes and his brother' (cf. Ex 7:11-12; Wacholder 2007:212) who stood up against Moses and Aaron who in turn arose 'by the hand of the prince of lights' during the exodus from Egypt (CD 5:18-19, DSSSE).

The writer then continues to note that later 'boundary shifters'⁴⁰⁴ arose and led Israel astray (by false prophecies) and into rebellion against God (CD 5:20-21), with the result that the 'land became desolate' because of their rebellion against God's commandments which they had received 'through the hand of Moses and also of the holy anointed ones' (CD 5:21-6:1, DSSSE). Though there may have been an initial allusion to the opposition of the ten spies against Caleb, Joshua and Moses at Kadesh Barnea (cf. Wacholder 2007:213), the 'desolate land' theme seems to refer to the time of the exile (and indeed the writer's own time⁴⁰⁵). Prior to the exile Judah was also beset by false prophets (cf. Jr 23; 28).⁴⁰⁶

⁴⁰³ Shemesh & Werman (1998:423) argue similarly. They point out that the 'derogatory expression לשון גרופים [blasphemous/slandering language; CD 5:11-12] ... used by the sect to denote flagrant transgression of the revealed law, is derived from Num 15:30-31' and that as far as the sectarians are concerned their opponents 'sin by defiantly interpreting the Torah's revealed commandments with "smooth words." In so doing, they spurn God and violate his commandments.'

⁴⁰⁴ Perhaps this was a sobriquet for the Pharisees (Wacholder 2007:213); the text alludes to Deuteronomy 19:14 (Wacholder 2007:213).

⁴⁰⁵ Wacholder (2007:215) rightly observes that there is a constant intermingling of the past, present and future in CD, and that the examples from past history simply function as a warning to the writer's generation of divine retribution to come. Thus history becomes a 'blueprint for the אהרית הימים "end of days"' (Wacholder 2007:215).

⁴⁰⁶ Wacholder (2007:213-214) however thinks that the reference is to the 40-year wilderness wanderings that followed Israel's refusal to go up into Canaan when God told them to. This is possible, but I believe that the writer is more likely to apply this to the Babylonian exile. The connection a few lines later to Leviticus 26 seems to substantiate this view.

The ‘nobles of the people’ are likened to those who search the scriptures⁴¹¹ until another teacher (באהרית; יורה צדק; ‘one who teaches righteousness’) will arise ‘at the end of days’ (באחרית; CD 6:11).

After a blank in the text, the writer then changes his theme. In CD 6:11-12 he instructs ‘those who have been brought into the covenant’⁴¹² that they must not ‘enter the sanctuary to light up the altar in vain’ (וכל אשר הובאו בברית לבלתי בוא אל המקדש להאיר חנם); (cf. 4Q266 3ii:18, DSSSEL, partly reconstructed). Here the reference to ‘covenant’ applies to the writer’s own contemporaries (הובאו בברית; cf. the expression באי בברית). He quotes Malachi 1:10⁴¹³ and exhorts his contemporaries (CD 6:11ff) to follow this injunction by Malachi. They must imitate those who refuse to offer anything below standard to God by making sure they follow the ‘exact interpretation of the law’ (כפשור התורה; DSSSE, CD 6:14), and they must keep themselves separate from those among their fellow Israelites who do not adhere to their strict interpretation of it.

Next a list of vices to be avoided (CD 6:14-18) is given, followed by the injunction to keep the Sabbath as well as other feast and fast days ‘according to its exact interpretation, ... according to what was discovered by those who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus’ (CD 6:18-19; cf. 4Q266 3ii:25, which is reconstructed in DSSSEL). The expression באי הברית החדשה בארץ דמשק, will be considered in more detail below.⁴¹⁴ Suffice it to say here that the writer is obviously referring to a group of people preceding him and his community. The writer’s community are their successors with the same aim of following the law according to a very strict interpretation. In CD 6:20-7:4 the writer continues with his exhortation to keep specific aspects of the law (in particular how

⁴¹¹ The writer continues to use the language of the Numbers quotation. He says they ‘dig the well with the staves that the sceptre decreed,’ חקקו המחקק אשר חקקו המחקק (DSSSE, CD 6:9; lit. ‘they cut the well with the decrees which have been decreed by the one who decrees’), with a neat pun on the root חקק. Cf. n. 496 below.

⁴¹² הובאו בברית = Hoph pf 3mp בוא. Murphy-O’Connor (1971b:554, 556) prefers the translation ‘agreement’ instead of ‘covenant’ here ‘to avoid giving a false impression’ (Murphy-O’Connor 1971b:554) concerning what the covenant here entails, i.e. something that is not to be done. However, Fitzmyer’s translation (‘And all who have been brought into the covenant, (agreeing) not to come to the sanctuary...’; Fitzmyer 1961:311) is to be preferred since, as Murphy-O’Connor (1971b:554) himself agrees, it ‘preserves the pregnant sense of בריית’ in the context.

⁴¹³ Malachi (1:10-14, esp. v. 10) reprimands his contemporaries for offering defective sacrifices and spurning Yahweh, to whom they should be offering the best of the flock. He goes on to say that someone should shut the gates of the temple so that such useless offerings will no longer be sacrificed as they do not please Yahweh at all (מִי גַם־בְּקֶבֶם וְיִסְגְּרוּ (דְּלִמְתִּים וְלֹא־תֵאֲרִיזוּ מִזְבְּחֵי הַנֶּחֱם).

⁴¹⁴ Hultgren (2007) discusses this term at length and his work will be considered in some detail.

to deal with fellow human beings, but religious rituals are also mentioned⁴¹⁵), some of which are reminiscent of the miscellaneous instructions set out in Leviticus 19.⁴¹⁶

To those who live thus in ‘perfect holiness’ and according to the whole admonition or instruction given, ‘God’s covenant is faithfulness/an assurance⁴¹⁷ to them for life for a thousand generations’ (CD 7:5-6; להם לחיותם אלה דור, ⁴¹⁸ ברית אל נאמנות, my translation, but cf. Schwartz & Baumgarten 1995:25; cf. also CD 14:2; 19:1). Here the writer seems to indicate that the covenant previously given (presumably both the covenant with the forefathers – Abraham, Isaac and Jacob – and the Sinai covenant are in view) is applicable to his own contemporaries, but its blessings are only for those who live according to its rules (as interpreted by the writer’s community). The idea is obviously that God will deal faithfully with those who are faithful to him. In the MT the root אמן does not occur often with ברית, and never in the precise sense that is used here in CD. The most important scripture containing both ברית and the root אמן (though not together as in CD 7:5-6) is Deuteronomy 7:9:⁴¹⁹ ‘Know therefore that the LORD your God, He is God, the faithful God (הַאֱלֹהִים הַנֶּאֱמָנִים), who keeps His covenant (ברית) and His lovingkindness to a thousandth generation (לְאֶלֶף דּוֹר) with those who love Him and keep His commandments’ (NASB). Though the exact wording of the two texts is different, we find in both the ideas of covenant, faithfulness and the promise for a thousand generations⁴²⁰ for faithful believers.⁴²¹ Another likely allusion is to Joshua 9:15 where a covenant is made with the Gibeonites ‘to let them live’ (וַיִּכְרַת לָהֶם בְּרִית לְחַיֹּתָם; cf. Wacholder 2007:234).

The rest of CD 7 deals with instructions for community members who are married and have families (‘those who reside in camps,’ line 6), and the consequences threatened to those who commit apostasy. The column includes a midrash on Isaiah 7:17 and Amos

⁴¹⁵ For example, CD 7:2-3 enjoins the members of the writer’s community not to bear grudges against each other, but rather to confront each other immediately if there is reason to do so. Then an interesting instruction is given, namely to ‘keep apart from every uncleanness according to their regulations, without anyone defiling his holy spirit, according to what God kept apart for them’ (CD 7:3-4, DSSSE). The context indicates that the ‘spirit’ of each community member is in view, not the Holy Spirit.

⁴¹⁶ E.g. Leviticus 19:18, וְאָהַבְתָּ לְרֵעֶךָ כְּמוֹךָ, ‘You shall love your neighbour as yourself’ (cf. Wacholder 2007:230). The writer also quotes from Isaiah 10:2.

⁴¹⁷ So with Clines (2009:255 = CDCH), who gives the glosses ‘trustworthiness, assurance’ for נֶאֱמָנִים, and Baumgarten & Schwartz (1995:25).

⁴¹⁸ Wacholder (2007:40) suggests the emendation of נאמנות to נאמנת, in accordance with CD 14:2, which uses exactly the same phrase, and which he emends in accordance with 4Q267 9v:4 (ברית אל נאמנת); cf. Wacholder 2007:234). However, the text makes sense as it stands.

⁴¹⁹ Part of this text is actually quoted in CD 19:1-2, which is parallel to CD 7:6. Since CD 19:1-7a more or less reproduce CD 7:5-10a, it is reasonable to assume that CD 7:5-6 is also based on Deuteronomy 7:9 (cf. Baumgarten & Schwartz 1995:25, n. 66; Wacholder 2007:234).

⁴²⁰ Whether or not this is a reference to eternal life is debated. Collins (2007b:39-40) thinks so (also based on CD 3:20), but notes that the thought is not developed in CD (Collins 2007b:40). Wacholder (2007:234) on the other hand suggests it is merely a reference to a long life span. I think that Collins is more likely to be right, especially because of CD 3:20.

⁴²¹ Another text, Psalm 89:29 (MT) is perhaps closer in actual syntax to CD, but the general meaning in CD is closer to Deuteronomy. In Psalm 89:29 God promises David that ‘my covenant shall be confirmed to him’ (NASB, Ps 89:28; MT v. 29, וּבְרִיתִי נֶאֱמָנֶת לּוֹ).

5:26-27, as well as on Numbers 24:17, all to substantiate the writer's view that severe punishment will befall apostates from the community.⁴²² Interpreting Numbers 24:17, the writer notes that 'The sceptre is the prince of the whole congregation and when he rises he will destroy all the sons of Seth. These (i.e. apparently the sons of Seth) escaped at the time of the first visitation while the renegades were delivered up to the sword. Thus will be the judgment of all those entering his covenant (משפט כל באי בריתו) but who do not remain steadfast in them' (CD 7:20-8:2, DSSSE; cf. 4Q266 3iii:24,⁴²³ DSSEL). Though the details are rather obscure,⁴²⁴ the general sense is clear. The writer tells his readers that those who join his community but fail to remain faithful to their covenant obligations will face 'destruction by Belial' (CD 8:2), though in actual fact it is God's judgment that befalls them (CD 8:2-3; cf. also Falk 2011:263).⁴²⁵ In other words, the covenant here is that of the writer's community, though of course it is based on a very strict interpretation of the Mosaic laws. Just as Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28 outline covenant blessings to Israel if they obey God and curses if they fail to do so, so the writer of CD includes promises and warnings for the members (and would-be members) of his community.⁴²⁶

The next few lines list some of sins that are being committed by the apostates, such as treason, fornication, greed and holding grudges (CD 8:3-7). Instead of keeping separate from outsiders, they continued to live by their 'wicked customs' (CD 8:8-9, DSSEL), which are likened to 'serpent's venom and cruel poison of asps' (CD 8:9-10, quoting from and interpreting Dt 32:33).⁴²⁷ But despite the fact that some of the members of his community became apostate, God nevertheless kept a faithful remnant among the rest,

⁴²² There has been some discussion on whether or not part of CD 7:9b-8:2a is an interpolation and why this section differs from the parallel in CD 19:5b-14. The arguments are too intricate to discuss here in detail and do not influence my argument (see Rabin 1958:viii; Murphy-O'Connor 1971c:379-386; Knibb 1991:243-248 for different positions). However, I do not agree with Knibb (1991:244-245) that the Amos-Numbers midrash is 'out of place' in the present context because 'it is not really concerned with the theme of future punishment, but with the settlement of the community it describes in 'Damascus', and with the coming of 'the interpreter of the law' and 'the prince of the whole congregation.' HALOT suggests that שֶׁט in Numbers 24:17 should read שָׁט, from שָׁטָה, 'uprising,' which would give the sense 'sons of uprising,' i.e. people who rebel, presumably against God. If this is the case, then all these texts indeed have something to do with punishment for all who fail to keep God's covenant. Even though the writer's association with the first part of Numbers 24:17 is first of all to the prophecy about the 'star' which will come up from Jacob, which gives him an opportunity to speak about the coming messiah, he still points out that this coming messiah will 'shatter all the sons of Sheth', i.e. punish rebels. The 'first period of God's judgment' (CD 7:21) where such rebels were destroyed may then possibly refer to the destruction of the first exodus generation in the wilderness, or perhaps more likely to the exile in Babylon, but this is conjecture.

⁴²³ Most of the letters of בְּרִיתוֹ are visible, at least to a certain extent: בּ are certain, ר is probable, ו are possible and ם is in square brackets and thus reconstructed.

⁴²⁴ What is meant by the 'sons of Seth' (or Sheth, DSSEL)? In what way did they 'escape in the first period of God's judgment'? See above note 422.

⁴²⁵ לפיכדם לבלוע הוא היום אשר יפקד אל; 'their judgment is complete annihilation by the hand of Belial, that is the day on which God will judge' (my translation).

⁴²⁶ Cf. Shemesh (2002:57) who rightly notes that the 'author is referring to persons who had already accepted the covenant but failed to adhere to the laws.'

⁴²⁷ It is interesting that in this context the writer identifies the 'cruel poison of asps' with the 'king of Yavan,' i.e. Greece (CD 8:11), which appears to indicate that at least this part of CD was a reaction to the Hellenizing influence of the Maccabean era. Wacholder (2007:242-243) however thinks that the 'king of Yavan' here refers to Alexander the Great and the change from Persian to Greek rule in the ANE. In my opinion this is less likely since the extremely negative picture of Greek rule only came to the fore during the Maccabean era.

including our writer. Quoting Deuteronomy 9:5 and 7:8 (CD 8:14-15), the writer is convinced that it was only because of God's grace and covenant faithfulness that this remnant remained. He continues: 'on account of God's love for the forefathers who (testified) following him, he loves those who come after them, because to them belongs the fathers' covenant' (CD 8:16-18, DSSSE: באהבת אל את הראשנים אשר היעירו (היעידו) אחריו אהב (את הבאים אחריהם כי להם ברית האבות).

The phrase 'covenant of the Fathers' (CD 8:18a; ברית האבות) also occurs in Deuteronomy 4:31⁴²⁸ and Malachi 2:10.⁴²⁹ CD 8:18 is closer to Deuteronomy 4:31. Similar ideas are also present elsewhere in Deuteronomy (e.g. 7:12; 8:18) and Jeremiah (31:32; 34:13), though the wording there is slightly different. The reference seems to be to the exodus from Egypt as a realization of the covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Therefore it is reasonable to assume that in CD 8:18 the writer refers back to the same events, but, as Baumgarten & Schwartz (1995:17, n. 24) note, the covenant of the fathers now only applies to the members of the sect since they are the only ones who are still keeping it faithfully (cf. also Wacholder 2007:243).⁴³⁰

The column concludes with another promise that those who remain faithful among 'all the men who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus'⁴³¹ (CD 8:21, DSSEL) will be rewarded with their life, like Baruch, Jeremiah's servant, but those who become apostates will be judged, just as happened to Gehazi, Elisha's servant.⁴³²

⁴²⁸ 'And he (i.e. God) will not forget the covenant of your fathers which he swore to them' (my translation; וְלֹא יִשְׁחִיחַ (וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח אֶת־בְּרִית אֲבוֹתֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע לָהֶם).

⁴²⁹ 'Why do we deal treacherously against each other and so profane the covenant of our fathers?' (my translation; מִדּוֹעַ (נִבְגַּד אִישׁ בְּאֵחָיו לְחַלֵּל בְּרִית אֲבוֹתֵינוּ).

⁴³⁰ Murphy-O'Connor (1972b:216) points out that the phrase ברית האבות also occurs in 1 Maccabees 2:20. He argues that the *Sitz im Leben* of CD 8:3-18 is probably the time when the (in the opinion of the Qumran community) legitimate High Priest was driven from office by Jonathan Maccabaeus and persecuted 'mercilessly' (Murphy-O'Connor 1972b:215-216). Murphy-O'Connor (1972b:216) suggests that 'He was the Teacher of Righteousness to his circle, and naturally his language influenced them in their chagrined tirade against those on whom they had counted for support in the reform. This group appropriated to itself the rallying cry of the Maccabees "the covenant of the Fathers", and characterised the descendants of Mattathias in terms evocative of those he used in raising the rebellion.' He adds that this group 'eventually left the Holy City to take refuge at Qumran' where the document that was written at that time became later 'incorporated into the compilation that is now the admonitory section of CD' and used to admonish 'members of the community tempted to withdraw their loyalty' (Murphy-O'Connor 1972b:216).

⁴³¹ CD 8 in fact breaks off in the middle of a sentence, after the phrase 'all the men who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus' (CD 8:21). I have included it in my interpretation since it appears that the writer does indeed refer to his own community.

⁴³² This interpretation is indebted to Wacholder (2007:243-244). The whole section and the expression 'all the men who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus' will be discussed in detail later.

3.2.2.7 CD 15-16

According to scholarly consensus, CD 15-16 should follow CD 8 (so also the arrangement in DSSSE, but not DSSEL).⁴³³ CD 15 starts with the injunction that oaths must not be made by the names or titles of God (אל and אדני) but ‘by the oath of the youth, by the curses of the covenant’ (CD 15:1-2, DSSSE, באלות הברית⁴³⁴ אום שבועת הבנים). The mention of ‘curses’ is reminiscent of Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28, i.e. the Sinai covenant, though interestingly the word אלה is not mentioned in these chapters. Rather, Deuteronomy 28 uses קללה, whereas Leviticus 26 circumscribes the word by simply listing the types of disasters that will befall the Israelites if they do not follow God’s commandments. Deuteronomy 29 however uses אלה in connection with the covenant made with the Israelites on the plain of Moab, on the brink of entry into Canaan. The chapter uses the word both simply for ‘oath’ as well as more specifically for ‘curse.’⁴³⁵ In the present context the writer obviously has in mind an oath that, if broken, would lead to a curse on the covenant breaker.

Why the injunction not to swear by the names or titles of God but by the ‘oath of youth’ is given in CD 15:1-3 is not clear. Perhaps there was a debate about the pronunciation of the name of Yahweh in oath formulae which some Jews may still have thought possible. The writer however extends the prohibition even to the words ‘God’ and ‘Lord,’ and continues to observe that not even the law should be mentioned in oath formulae because it contains the full name of God.⁴³⁶ A person who has sworn by the

⁴³³ Baumgarten & Schwartz (1995) insert columns 19-20 from manuscript B after column 8 and before columns 15-16 of manuscript A. I follow the arrangement in DSSSE.

⁴³⁴ This word is difficult. Schechter (1910:54) had originally reconstructed שבועת הב[רית], ‘oath of the covenant,’ but this has not been followed by other scholars. Ginzberg (1912:671) reads שבועה הכתובה ‘the oath that is written,’ in accordance with Deuteronomy 29:20 and 2 Chronicles 34:24. DSSSE translates the phrase שבועת הבנים ‘oath of the youths’ (reading הבנים); DSSEL Hebrew reads שבועת הבנים but translates ‘oath of those who enter’ (reading in effect הבאים, as do Baumgarten & Schwartz 1995:36-37; the dots above בנים indicate the doubtful nature of these letters). Wacholder (2007:307) adopts the reading ‘oath of youths’ and suggests that though the exact meaning is unclear, it may refer to a father annulling oaths of his children or the vows of children during the distribution of an inheritance. Ultimately, however, he prefers the interpretation adopted here, namely that it refers to youths entering into the sectarian covenant community (Wacholder 2007:307).

⁴³⁵ Cf. the definitions in HALOT. It is interesting that the word only occurs 34 times in the OT, which the NASB translates ‘oath’ thirteen times, including twice in Deuteronomy 29; all other occurrences are translated ‘curse.’ All six occurrences in Deuteronomy appear in chapters 29 (5x) and 30 (1x), and are twice translated ‘oath’ (Dt 29:12, 14) and four times ‘curse.’

The DSS only use the word fourteen times, of which four appear in CD (plus four more in cave 4 fragments of CD), two in IQS, one in 4Q390 (4QapocrJer) and the other three in very small fragments of only one or two or four words in the respective line (word search conducted by me on DSSEL). As for CD 15, Wacholder (2007:307-308) similarly suggests that the meaning of אלות הברית is probably the same as אלות בריתי in CD 1:17 and refers to the covenant curses of Deuteronomy 29:20 and 27:13-26.

⁴³⁶ Baumgarten & Schwartz (1995:37, n. 126) remark that ‘The thrust of this law is to ban oaths by any divine name or by the torah, which has the divine name in it. Obligatory oaths are to be by the curses of the covenant only. This would explain Josephus’ report that the Essenes do not swear, yet pronounce “tremendous oaths” upon admission to membership (War 2. 139).’ Schechter (1910:54), XIX n. 3 remarks that this is contra the Samaritans who did allow oaths by the Tetragrammaton. Perhaps it was to counteract such permissiveness that the sectarians made the law even stricter. Dupont-Sommer (1962:160, n. 3) rightly points out the parallel to Jesus’ prohibition of oaths in Matthew 5:34-36. Wacholder (2007:308) believes that oaths in the name of the Tetragrammaton were to be

‘curses [or oaths] of the covenant’ (CD 15:3, DSSSE, [ואם באלות הברית ישב]יעו) and is found guilty of transgressing must make full confession and restitution in order to be forgiven (CD 15:3-4). It is uncertain whether covenant here refers to the sectarian’s commitment to keep the Mosaic law, or to that law generally. In the context, the former is more likely since there is a prohibition on the mention of the law as well. In particular, it seems to refer to the vows of new entrants into the community (cf. CD 15:5-6; Wacholder 2007:307).

The writer then gives instructions to community members (lit. ‘those who enter the covenant,’ CD 15:5, והבא בברית) who are married and have children (CD 15:5ff). Apparently it is expected that when the sons [children?] come of age,⁴³⁷ they are introduced into the community by having imposed upon them ‘the oath of the covenant’ (DSSSE, CD 15:6, בשבועת הברית),⁴³⁸ thus going ‘over to the enrolled’ (DSSSE, CD 15:6, לעבור על הפקודים). Covenant here obviously refers to the community’s commitment to the Mosaic law as interpreted by them. The writer continues to note that outsiders (לכל השב) מזרכו הנשחתה, ‘all those who turn from their corrupt ways,’ CD 15:7, my translation) who wish to join the community will be accepted on the same basis: after having been examined by the מבקר as to their suitability, they ‘shall enrol him with the oath of the covenant which Moses established with Israel, the covenant to rev[ert to] the law of Moses with the whole heart and [with] the who[le] soul’ (DSSSE, CD 15:8-10, יפקדוהו בשבועת, הברית אשר כרת משה עם ישראל את הברית לש[וב] אל תורת משה בכל לב ו[ב]כ[ל] נפש).⁴³⁹ In other words, the entry procedure is the same for those who have grown up in the system as for those who want to join the community from outside; one does not become a member automatically just because one has grown up in the community (cf. García Martínez 2007:198-199). When youngsters come of age, they must swear the same oath and voluntarily submit to the rules as new members from outside must do.⁴⁴⁰ Here the writer sees himself as well as the community he belongs to as the heirs of the Mosaic covenant, whose stipulations they have sworn to keep strictly. Thus though ‘those who enter the covenant’ are community members adhering to the community rules, these rules are at the same time those of the covenant of Moses (i.e. the Sinai covenant), as interpreted by them.

restricted to the oath by entrants into the sect’s covenant, rather than generally used in business transactions. This is possible.

⁴³⁷ Baumgarten & Schwartz (1995:39, n. 128) remark that this happened at the age of 20, which ‘was also the time for the one-time payment of the half-shekel (4QOrd^{a,b}).’ It is not clear whether בנימ is to be taken narrowly as ‘sons’ or more generally as ‘children,’ which would include daughters. In view of CD 16:6-10 it would appear that the word is general in nature.

⁴³⁸ 4Q270 6i:20-21 are parallel. However, in each line only one word is readable; everything else has been reconstructed by the editor(s).

⁴³⁹ 4Q271 4i:11-12 are parallel. The text is extremely fragmentary. Only one letter or at most one word is readable in each line; everything else has been reconstructed.

⁴⁴⁰ Contra Nitzan (2010a:106) who assumes that since the children had been raised in the community they probably did not need to take the oath, unlike outsiders wishing to join. In my opinion, the present text precludes this position.

Grossman (2002:164) rightly observes that the language of CD 15:8-10 indicates that ‘This covenant of return ... is, at once, the special possession of the community described in the text and also fundamentally tied to the Sinai experience of the people of Israel’ (cf. also Holtz 2009:38-39). In this context the word for ‘oath’ is not אלה (which also carries the connotation of ‘curse’ in certain circumstances) but שבועה.⁴⁴¹ The idea behind the word seems to be a binding oath, a commitment to follow through on that which is promised.⁴⁴²

The remainder of column 15 is given to instructions regarding new-comers who want to enter the community, how this must happen and who may or may not join: excluded are, for example, all who have a physical or mental defect (CD 15:15-17). This is interesting as in the HB priests with physical or mental defects were not permitted to serve in the sanctuary (Lv 21:17-23), though they were still allowed to eat from the sacred food.⁴⁴³ It appears that the writer considers himself and the members of his community as true priests, a notion that appears also in the NT (1 Pt 2:5).

CD 15:18-20 are not preserved, but 4Q271 (4QD^f) 4ii:1-3 fills in some of the missing words. The writer says that ‘He (presumably God) will make a covenant [with the house of Israel and the house of Judah,]⁴⁴⁴ and concerning [this?] coven[ant he spoke to Moses,] saying: “[In] accordance with these wo[rds] I have made a covenant with you and with Israel”’ (DSSSEL). The words in italics are quoted from Exodus 34:27, ‘על־פִּי הַדְּבָרִים , הָאֵלֶּה פְּרַתִּי אֶתֶּךָ בְּרִית וְאֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל .’ CD uses the preposition עם instead of את and the verb is 2mp instead of 2ms, i.e. עמכם ברית ועם ישראל, but the sense is the same as in Exodus. CD 16:1 takes up these last words, but adds ‘all’: ‘with you a covenant and with *all* Israel’ (CD 16:1, DSSSE, עמכם ברית ועם כל ישראל). The text continues to note that those who promise to return and abide by Moses’ commandments will no longer be bothered by the ‘angel Mastema’ (DSSSE, CD 15:5) or ‘the angel of Obstruction’ (DSSSEL; 4Q271 4ii continues to be parallel at this point), provided ‘he keeps his word’ (אם יקים את דבריו; CD 16:6).⁴⁴⁵ As an example of someone who did ‘keep his word’ as soon as he was aware of God’s requirements of him the writer cites Abraham, who got circumcised ‘on the day he gained

⁴⁴¹ The word occurs thirty times in the HB. NASB translates it twenty-eight times ‘oath,’ and once each ‘curse’ (Is 65:15) and ‘chastisement’ (Hb 3:9).

⁴⁴² Wacholder (2007:316) rightly observes that the main idea behind CD 15:6-16:6a is an echo of Deuteronomy 6:5 (‘You shall love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your might;’ NASB).

⁴⁴³ Sacrificial animals too had to be without any defect (Lv 22:19-20).

⁴⁴⁴ Wacholder (2007:313) argues for a connection between the Mosaic covenant and the new covenant of Jeremiah 31:31-34 here because of the words ‘with Israel and with Judah.’ Hultgren (2007:113-114) also speaks of ‘a certain interchangeability of the terms “covenant” and “new covenant”’ in this passage (the quote is from Hultgren 2007:113). Since the ‘new covenant’ seems to simply mean the correct interpretation of the Mosaic covenant (cf. Hultgren 2007:113), this is correct.

⁴⁴⁵ Kister (1999:172) even suggests that ‘joining the sect is ... an act of expulsion of evil spirits,’ and (rightly) points out that in Christianity a similar concept applies. The Christian, through baptism, is united to the death and resurrection of Christ, and therefore is no longer under the dominion of sin (Ro 6) or a slave ‘to the elementary principles of this world’ (Col 2:20; cf. Gal 4:3) and should therefore live accordingly (cf. Ro 6; Kister 1999:176).

true knowledge' (CD 16:6; DSSSEL; ביום דעתו).⁴⁴⁶ The reference is to the covenant with Abraham in Genesis 17 where God confirmed the covenant with Abraham made in Genesis 15, and commanded as a sign of this covenant the circumcision of all males (Gn 17:10ff). At the beginning of the chapter, before giving his promises to him, God told Abraham to 'walk before him and be perfect' (Gn 17:1; והתהלך לפניו והיה תמים), a phrase that is repeated almost verbatim in 1QS 1:8 (ולהתהלך לפניו תמים; 'walk perfectly before him;'; cf. 1QS^b 5:22) where it describes the community's purpose. Similar phraseology is found also at CD 2:15-16, which also enjoins the members of the community to 'walk perfectly in all his [i.e. God's] ways' (להתהלך תמים בכל דרכיו).

In the remainder of CD 16 the writer speaks about the importance of keeping the oath to strictly adhere to the Mosaic law and to refuse to break it even to the point of death (CD 15:6-9, cf. 4Q271 4ii:8-10, after referring to Dt 23:24 מוצא שקתיך תשמור).⁴⁴⁷ This rule also applies to women whose husbands or fathers must annul their wives' (or daughters') vows if they violated the covenant (CD 15:12-12, DSSSE, אם לעבור ברית; cf. 4Q271 4ii:12). Covenant here seems to refer both to the Sinai covenant as well as that of the community to keep it strictly according to their rules (cf. Grossman 2002:163-164). The last lines of column 16 are somewhat obscure as the text is broken. Rules are given as to what may be consecrated to God. It is interesting that one of the things someone might consecrate to God is a field (the exact regulations for this are unclear) as it is reminiscent of the sale of a field by Barnabas in Acts 4.

3.2.2.8 CD 9-11

CD 9:2 starts a new section dealing with interpersonal relationships, in particular where people have issues against each other (CD 9:2-10b); what to do with lost property when it is found, but the owner not known (CD 9:10c-16a); how do deal with a person possibly deserving the death penalty (CD 9:16b-22); and who may be a witness against someone who has transgressed a law (CD 9:23-10:3). In CD 9:2-3 the verb בוא occurs again with ברית, here in the Hiphil (pt ms) in the phrase מביאו [מבאי] ברית (cf. 4Q270 6iii:16-18).⁴⁴⁸

⁴⁴⁶ This interpretation is indebted to Kister (1999:180) who observes that in the context of CD 16:4-6 'Abraham's circumcision is mentioned merely because of his prompt performance of God's commandment' which 'would be an illustration of man's implementation of his share in *the covenant that he already has* with God' (italics his). In other words, 'Abraham's circumcision is analogous to the behavior expected of a member of the sect when a new commandment of God comes to his knowledge' (Kister 1999:181). The remainder of CD 16 continues to point out to the members of the sect how covenant faithfulness should be implemented.

⁴⁴⁷ Cf. Schiffman (2008:560) who rightly notes that if someone had vowed to do or not do something he/she was obliged to abide by this vow, even if it meant risking or losing one's life in doing so.

⁴⁴⁸ 4Q270 testifies to the fact that column 16 should precede column 9. In the text of 4Q270 6iii:17 הברית is largely reconstructed as only the first letter, ה, is visible. However, the fragment is generally fairly well preserved so that the context is quite clear.

The writer states that members of his community (lit. those ‘who have been brought into the covenant’ DSSSE; ‘covenant member’ DSSEL) who bring a groundless ‘accusation against [any] fellow’ member (i.e. something that others have not witnessed also) or even just express anger and tell on another member before the elders of the community, act as if they are taking the law into their own hand and bear a grudge (cf. Lv 19:17-18, which the writer quotes in CD 9:7-8, though he replaces MT’s רָעִידָה for רָעִיד). The writer implicitly exhorts his fellows, by quoting Nahum 1:2 (CD 9:5) which states that vengeance belongs to God alone, to refrain from such behaviour, especially if factual evidence is lacking (cf. Wacholder 2007:321). The covenant here is obviously that of the sect.

CD 10:4ff gives instructions about who may be a ‘judge’ in the community. There must be a ‘quorum’ (Baumgarten & Schwartz 1995:45, translation of CD 10:4, also note 151) of ten men, four of whom must be ‘from the tribe of Levi and of Aaron and six from Israel’ (CD 10:5).⁴⁴⁹ Furthermore, these men must be ‘learned in the book of HAGY and in the principles of the covenant’ (CD 10:6, DSSSE, מבוננים בספר ההגיה וביסודי הברית; cf. 4Q266 8iii:6⁴⁵⁰), and they must be ‘between twenty-five and sixty years’ of age (CD 10:6-7). It is not certain what is meant by the ‘Book of Hagi,’⁴⁵¹ but Baumgarten & Schwartz (1995:45, n. 153) suggest it may have been ‘a collection of Torah interpretations by Qumran teachers,’ a suggestion taken up by Nitzan (2010a:108). This is a reasonable assumption, which, it seems, also applies to the term ‘principles of the covenant’ (יסודי הברית). The expression יסודי הברית (lit. ‘foundations of the covenant;’ CD 10:6) obviously refers to the regulations of the covenant of the community, i.e. their strict interpretation of the Mosaic law. An age restriction for the ministry of Levites is prescribed in Numbers 4:3 (30-50 years of age) and 8:24-25 (25-50 years).⁴⁵² CD has extended this period by ten years to sixty. In 1 Chronicles 23:24, 27 we are told that David reduced the age of entrance into service for Levites to 20 years (1 Chr 23:24, 27); perhaps circumstances had changed since the time of Moses (cf. Barker 1999:190, note on Nu 8:24). No upper age limit is given by the Chronicler. Similar changes in circumstances may have influenced the age restriction

⁴⁴⁹ This in accordance with 2 Chronicles 19:8 where ‘Levites, priests and heads of father’s households’ (NASB) were appointed by Jehoshaphat to constitute a ‘central court in Jerusalem’ (Hultgren 2007:214).

⁴⁵⁰ The line is partly reconstructed. The word הברית is reconstructed; וביסודי is partly reconstructed and appears with a probable ש rather than ס. Cf. 4Q270 6iv:17; הברית is clearly visible. This fragment is quite well preserved so that the context is not in doubt.

⁴⁵¹ Baumgarten & Schwartz (1995:45, n. 153) note that the ‘nature of the “Book of Hagi” remains uncertain, but the term presumably derives from the injunction to “meditate (*hgh*) on it (the law) day and night” (Josh 1:8, Ps 1:2).’ Wacholder (2007:329) agrees and suggests it may be a psalm-like work.

⁴⁵² Fleming (1990:261) suggests that the difference may indicate a five-year training period before the Levites actually started full service (so also NASB Study Bible note on Nu 4:3, see Barker 1999:183).

here in CD.⁴⁵³ The remainder of columns 10 and 11 deal with regulations regarding purity and Sabbath observance, both of which are interpreted in a very strict manner.

3.2.2.9 CD 12-13

The beginning of column 12 continues the strict regulations of the community, beginning with how to conduct oneself in Jerusalem, the ‘city of the temple.’ Then rules are given regarding someone ‘in whom the spirits of Belial dominate’ (12:2): such a person is to be guarded, and ‘if he is cured of it, they shall guard him for seven [more] years and afterwards he may enter the assembly’ (12:5-6). Next rulings are given as to how to deal with gentiles. No one should covet their wealth (and kill a gentile for gain), and clean animals must not be sold to them lest they be offered to idols (12:6-9). Neither must other items be sold to them, nor slaves ‘for they entered the covenant of Abraham with him’ (CD 12:11, DSSSE; אשר בוא עמו ברית אברהם). Perhaps these slaves had converted to Judaism (cf. Schiffman 2011:562).⁴⁵⁴ The reference here is apparently to Genesis 17:9-14, in particular verses 12-13 which refer to the circumcision of servants and slaves (cf. Wacholder 2007:342, who notes that circumcision is part of the conversion process). By implication it seems such slaves were considered members of the community. Davies (1995:138) however thinks otherwise, as he notes that the status of slaves was ambiguous, but in his opinion they ‘were never to become members of the sect.’⁴⁵⁵

Column 12 continues to detail purity regulations: clean food (i.e. what can be eaten and what not), and what utensils are considered clean or not. From 12:20b onwards rules are given to the משכיל (wise/understanding person) regarding life in the community. The community is divided like Israel in the wilderness into camps of tens, fifties, hundreds and thousands (13:1-2), and it is stipulated that at least one priest or Levite (who will be in charge) must be in each group of ten. Priests who were not yet conversant with the rules of the community were instructed by the מבקר (‘overseer’, DSSEL; CD 13:5-6), and, in

⁴⁵³ However, 10:8-10 stipulates that the reason for this ruling is because ‘on account of man’s unfaithfulness his days were shortened, and because of God’s wrath against the inhabitants of the earth he ordered <to remove> their knowledge before they completed their days’ (DSSSE).

⁴⁵⁴ Lohse (1964:286, n. 77) states that gentile slaves of Jews had to be circumcised, and that Jewish slaves could not be sold to pagans.

⁴⁵⁵ So also Harrington (2008:195-196) who states that gentiles, even if they converted to Judaism as these slaves in CD 12:11 apparently did, and ‘participated in communal meetings (CD 14:4-6),’ they nonetheless never achieved ‘full status’ as members. She is of course right to note that ‘the Community Rule never mentions such a category’ (Harrington 2008:196) but neither does it explicitly exclude the possibility. On the other hand, the Community Rule is even stricter on certain laws than CD, and this may be one such issue where CD and IQS differ.

accordance with biblical law, a priest had to decide upon cases of leprosy (13:5-6) ‘even if he is a simpleton’⁴⁵⁶ (CD 13:6, DSSSE).

CD 13:7ff outlines the duties of the מבקר. He is the instructor of the community, more a father than a teacher, and caring for the members like a shepherd for his sheep. Though it is not explicitly stated, there seems to be an allusion to Ezekiel 34:16.⁴⁵⁷ The מבקר of the community must be like the ‘good shepherd’ envisaged by Ezekiel (CD 13:7-10). More instructions are given concerning his duties, in particular regarding newcomers (CD 13:11-12). He is to examine closely any newcomers to the community with regard to their way of life and wealth, and assign them their appropriate place. Newcomers may not be introduced into the community by anyone unless the מבקר gives permission (CD 13:7-13).

CD 13:14 stipulates rather enigmatically that ‘those who have entered the covenant’ must not have any dealings with ‘sons of Dawn, except hand to hand’ (DSSSE, ואיש מכל באי ברית אל ישא ואל יתן לבני השחר⁴⁵⁸ כי אם כף לכף⁴⁵⁹). Who are these ‘sons of Dawn’? DSSSEL interprets the phrase as ‘corrupt people’ (i.e. reading in effect בני השחת), whereas DSSSE simply translates literally. ‘From hand to hand’ is an idiomatic expression that does not occur in the HB and perhaps may indicate a once-off occasion or something like our ‘cash-up-front.’⁴⁶⁰ Hultgren (2007:294, n. 140) notes that ‘CD III,14-15 has sometimes been cited as a parallel to 1QS V, 16-17, allowing commerce between members of the covenant and the “sons of the pit” in the case of cash exchanges but not for credit or contract.’ But he then refers to Baumgarten (1983:81-85) who argues that these lines more likely regulate ‘the trade within the covenant (among the “sons of dawn”): בני השחר, requiring that they not profit commercially from each other but instead provide mutual help and fraternal service’ (Hultgren 2007:294, n. 140). Considering the difficulty of the original (as shown in the photograph published by Baumgarten 1983:Plate 9A),⁴⁶¹ it is

⁴⁵⁶ DSSSEL’s ‘ignorant’ is perhaps a better translation of the word פתי here as it does not have the negative connotations of ‘simpleton.’

⁴⁵⁷ Ezekiel 34:16 comes after an indictment of the leaders of Israel who did not care for the people, so that God will raise up a ‘good shepherd’ who will in fact do just that. It reads: ‘I will search for the lost and bring back the strays. I will bind up the injured and strengthen the weak, but the sleek and the strong I will destroy. I will shepherd the flock with justice.’

⁴⁵⁸ The last letter is doubtful. DSSSEL has ך, indicating a probable letter. Schechter (1910:53, n. 16) emends the word נכר to שכר, ‘stranger,’ but since the ן seems to be clearly visible this is, I think, not justified. Some emend the word to שכח, ‘pit,’ e.g. Lohse (1964:95), who translates ‘Grube’; Fitzmyer (1970:22), who suggests the emendation from ... *bny hšhr* to *lbny hšht kfy*; García Martínez (1996:43, ‘pit’). Vermes (1998:142) gives both options.

⁴⁵⁹ This text has a parallel in 4Q267 9iv:9-11, but the text is quite fragmentary and has been restored using the present text in DSSSEL. Each line has only three or four readable or just partly reconstructed words or expressions. Schechter (1910:53, n. 15 & 16) observes that CD is damaged in this line.

⁴⁶⁰ Cf. Lohse (1964:95), who translates ‘von Hand zu Hand,’ which he explains on p. 286, n. 86, ‘mit Barzahlung.’

⁴⁶¹ It seems Baumgarten (1983:82) is rather too optimistic when he states that the new photograph ‘indicates *without doubt* that the word must be read *השכר*’ (italics added). Wacholder (2007:347) however agrees with him and interprets the line as indicating that ‘conventional trade’ using cash within the community was forbidden (only

hard to decide one way or another. CD 13:15b-16a regulates the basis upon which business transactions may be performed by members of the community, namely under the supervision of the מבקר. This seems to indicate that CD 13:14-15a also deals with the same subject.⁴⁶² Another point in favour of the interpretation that the ‘sons of Dawn’ are members of the community is that 4Q298 (4Qcr-A Words Maskil) 1-2i begins ‘[Word]s of a Maskil which he spoke to all Sons of Dawn’ ([דבר]י משכיל אשר דבר לכול בני שחר). Here the expression ‘sons of dawn’ is clearly a reference to an enlightened group (‘men of understanding’), and so it is at least possible that the reference in CD similarly is not to outsiders but insiders. In favour of the other view is that the ך in the phrase בני השחר is in doubt (there is a dot over it in DSSEL, which indicates a probable letter, though the reading has been accepted in DSSSE). Hempel (2003b:66) observes the difficulties of the reading of a *taw* instead of the visible *resh*, but argues that the downward stroke of the *taw* may have faded away. In her opinion, the reading ‘sons of the pit’ fits well with her observations on the enemies of the community that are the object of her study (Hempel 2003b:65-66). Moreover, the phrase בני השחר is a *hapax legomenon* in CD, and the manner of self-designation by the community members usually includes the words ‘men’ (איש) or ‘neighbour’ (רע) or ‘brother’ (אה) (so Hempel 2003b:66-67). The phrase בני השחר is mentioned also at CD 6:15, and Hempel (2003b:67) believes that the covenant context of the phrase in CD 13 is in opposition to the ‘pit’ terminology; therefore she prefers the reading בני השחת. However, this is a debatable issue. As already pointed out, the context makes it at least possible that the phrase points to insiders and therefore I believe that the reading בני השחר may be upheld and the reference is to insiders, but one cannot be dogmatic.

The last few lines of CD 13 are rather fragmentary (see Baumgarten & Schwartz 1995:55), but they apparently conclude with a quotation from Isaiah 7:17, which continues into line 1 of CD 14.⁴⁶³ The quotation comes in the wake of further instructions to the מבקר on how he must conduct himself. Isaiah notes that God will bring judgment on his people, i.e. days ‘such as have not come since the day on which Ephraim became separated from Judah’ (DSSSE, 14:1). As for all those who walk ‘in these’ (presumably the law as interpreted by the community of the writer), ‘the covenant of God is faithful to save them from all the nets of the pit’ (DSSSE, 14:2;⁴⁶⁴ ברית אל נאמנות להם להנצילם מכל מוקשי שחת

barter trade was allowed), though limited trade with outsiders is implicitly allowed. In either case, the permission of the supervisor must be sought first.

⁴⁶² Limited trade with outsiders and even gentiles was permitted, according to CD 12:9.

⁴⁶³ DSSEL and DSSSE complete the last line of column 13 with this quotation, but Baumgarten & Schwartz (1995:55) do not.

⁴⁶⁴ Another parallel is found in 4Q267 9v:4; this text has the word אל in palaeo-Hebrew script. See also 4Q269 10ii:6-8; this text is very fragmentary and much has been restored.

paralleled in 4Q266 9iii:19, reconstructed). Probably the reference is to the blessings of the covenant as outlined in Leviticus 16 and Deuteronomy 28, but this is of course only an assumption. In other words, those who hold fast to God's covenant will experience God's deliverance in times of danger and temptation.

3.2.2.10 CD 19-20

CD 19-20 partly overlaps with CD 7-8.⁴⁶⁵ Both sections deal in detail with members who have failed to continue in their commitment to the community. CD 7-8 cites from Amos, Numbers and Deuteronomy to substantiate the argument, whereas in CD 19-20 the writer quotes from Ezekiel and Hosea, as well as Numbers and Deuteronomy. In CD 19-20, the writer warns the members of the community of the judgment that will befall those who enter the community but who do not continue to keep its strict laws. Column 19 starts in the middle of a sentence which contains words from CD 7:5c-6a, but unlike CD 7 proceeds to quote Deuteronomy 7:9 before going on to outline how the rules of the community apply to members who live 'in camps' (CD 19:2b-4). CD 19:1-2 reads: נאמנות להם לחיותם (DSSEL; 'assurance to them to give them life for thousands of generations, as it is writ[ten]: "He who keeps the covenant and the faithfulness to those who love [him] and to those who keep my commandments for a thousand generations;"' my translation in analogy to 7:5-6). If the same context as 7:5ff is assumed (see comments on that section), then the reference here is to the Sinai covenant, but obviously also includes the earlier patriarchal covenant. This is applied to current members of the community.

From CD 19:5 onwards the writer addresses the issue of those members who 'despise the precepts and the ordinances' (presumably of the Mosaic covenant, but impliedly also their strict interpretation by the writer's community; cf. DSSSE, CD 19:5-6). They will face severe judgment, as indicated in Zechariah 13:7,⁴⁶⁶ and only those who remain faithful will escape the coming judgment 'when there comes the messiah of Aaron and Israel'⁴⁶⁷ (CD 19:10-11). Those who remain faithful are likened to those marked 'with a *tau* [on] the foreheads of those who sigh and groan' (DSSSE, CD 19:12, italics added; cf.

⁴⁶⁵ This is probably why Baumgarten & Schwartz have put them immediately after column 8. For exact ways in which the columns overlap see Baumgarten & Schwartz (1995:25, n. 65).

⁴⁶⁶ חָרֵב עֹרֵי עַל־רֵעִי וְעַל־גֵּבֵר עִמִּיתִי נֶאֱמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת הָיָה אֶת־הָרֶעֱוָה וְתַפְוֹצִין הַצֹּאן וְהַשְּׂבִתִי יָדִי עַל־הַצֹּעְרִים 'Awake, O sword, against My Shepherd, And against the man, My Associate,' Declares the LORD of hosts. Strike the Shepherd that the sheep may be scattered; And I will turn My hand against the little ones' (NASB). The writer then continues to contrast 'the little ones' who receive punishment with 'the poor of the flock' who 'heed God's word.' Dupont-Sommer (1962:137) translates the last phrase in CD 19:9 'I will turn my hand *to* the little ones,' i.e. favourably (italics added; cf. also Davies 1982a:151). Since the preposition is על, which is more naturally translated 'against, upon' (in the negative sense), this is in my opinion less likely, and therefore I prefer the interpretation of DSSEL.

⁴⁶⁷ This reference to the Messiah of Aaron and Israel is unique to CD 19 (manuscript B).

Ezk 9:4, which is quoted with slight emendations). The writer then observes that those not so marked would be judged by ‘the avenging sword, the vengeance of the covenant’ (my translation;⁴⁶⁸ CD 19:13; לחרב נוקמת נקם ברית – a direct quotation from Lv 26:25; cf. CD 1:17-18 above). As above in CD 1:17-18, this is a reference to the covenant curses that would befall Israel in case of apostasy. In the same way, the writer observes, those who enter the covenant [of his community] but ‘do not remain steadfast in these precepts’ (באי החקים בריתו אשר לא יחזיקו באלה החקים, DSSSE CD 19:13-14) will experience the curses of the covenant (both those of the Sinai covenant and of the community). The text reads literally ‘his’ (i.e. presumably God’s) covenant. The writer therefore identifies his community with the Sinai covenant whose commandments they have agreed to keep to the letter. He warns his readers of the consequences of apostasy and continues to give more warnings, now apparently also to leaders of the community, by citing Hosea 5:10 (CD 19:15-16).⁴⁶⁹ In this verse Hosea speaks about the princes of Judah (or possibly: ‘those who departed from Judah;’ עֲרֵי יְהוּדָה) who remove boundary stones and on whom God will pour out his wrath.⁴⁷⁰ The idea appears to be that the members likened to the ‘princes of Judah’ deviated from the strict interpretation of the law as practised by the writer’s community.

The writer explains that these people ‘entered the covenant of conversion’ (ברית תשובה),⁴⁷¹ but instead of living up to the covenant expectations they refused to turn away from their wicked ways and continued to live sinful lives, committing such sins as

⁴⁶⁸ DSSSE translates ‘the sword that makes retaliation for covenant violations.’

⁴⁶⁹ הִיוּ עֲרֵי יְהוּדָה כְּמַסְיָגֵי גְבוּל עַל־יָדָם אֲשֶׁפוּד פְּנִיָּם עֲבָרְתֵי (The princes of Judah have become like those who move a boundary; on them I will pour out My wrath like water; NASB). The quotation is exact, except for some minor spelling differences: MT reads סוג instead of CD’s שוג and Mt has עֲבָרְתֵי, ‘my wrath,’ whereas CD reads simply ‘wrath.’

⁴⁷⁰ Hultgren (2007:12) argues that in CD the translation of עֲרֵי should not be ‘princes’ but ‘those who departed’, which in his opinion makes more sense in the context, based on his belief in the unity of CD 7:9-8:12 and 19:5b-25a. In favour of this view is the fact that in DSSSE CD 7:12-13 both סור (CD 7:12) and שר (CD 7:13) appear; there is apparently a word play on these two words (compare מיום סור אפרים מעל יהודה, CD 7:12 = Is 7:17 with שר אפרים מעל יהודה, CD 7:13), with only a hint at Hosea, since the context in CD 7 is a quotation from Isaiah 7:17. However, there is no such wordplay in CD 19:15; the context there is a quotation from Hosea, which is then followed by quite a different argument than that in CD 7. Community leaders are the subject there too, but the argument comes from Amos. Therefore while Hultgren may possibly be right, I think the different contexts do not quite substantiate his argument.

⁴⁷¹ This expression, which is unique to CD 19, will be treated in more detail below. The parallel text in CD 8:4 does not have these words. Instead of speaking about covenant, CD 8:4 speaks about the sins of the people that are so ingrained that they are incurable. Murphy-O’Connor (1972b:201) notes that the fourth word of the A-text, i.e. CD 8:4, is corrupt, and the most likely reconstruction is that offered by Rabin (1958:32-33) and taken up by many scholars, so that the text now reads “‘They hoped for healing, but the blemish shall cleave’” (Murphy-O’Connor 1972b:202). Murphy-O’Connor (1972b:201) rightly observes that the emendation fits well into the context of the Hosea quotation that precedes CD 8:4, but even if this was the original reading, it is still rather enigmatic (Murphy-O’Connor 1972b:202). It is therefore likely, as Murphy-O’Connor (1972b:202) and others have assumed, that the B Text, i.e. CD 19:16, adapted the reading to something more comprehensible. Murphy-O’Connor (1972b:202) suggests that there may be an implicit warning that ‘physical sickness will be the fate of those who do not obey the precepts’ (cf. Lv 24:16, 21, 25).

White (1987:537) believes that both manuscripts of CD stem from one source. Trying to explain the discrepancies between them, she suggests the phrase ברית תשובה may be ‘a modernizing alteration,’ and that, since the A text (i.e. CD 8:4) is corrupt, the scribe of manuscript B altered the text by substituting ‘a phrase that was both understandable and (to him) consonant with the rest of the theology of CD (the presence of the word BRYT might serve this purpose)’ (White 1987:547). This is of course possible, but cannot be proven.

licentiousness, bearing grudges and taking revenge on their fellows etc (CD 19:16ff), thus walking in the stubbornness of their own heart (CD 19:20; for CD 19:17-34a see CD 8:4-21). The expression *ברית תשובה* is unique to both the DSS and the HB, and *תשובה* is nowhere else connected to *ברית*. The whole expression has been translated ‘covenant of conversion’ (DSSSE) or ‘covenant of repentance’ (Baumgarten & Schwartz 1995:33) or ‘covenant repenting’ (DSSEL), but it is remarkable that this is the only occurrence where *תשובה* is translated in this manner.

Six of the eight occurrences of *תשובה* in the HB refer to the return of either a person to a place or the coming again, lit. ‘return,’ of a [time of] year, and twice to the response of a person to someone’s speech (Job 21:34; 34:36). In the DSS, the term occurs nine times, once in CD, five times in Hodayot,⁴⁷² and three times in various fragments of 4Q Instruction (417, 418, 418^a), mostly in very fragmentary texts that contribute nothing to the meaning of the word. In all places where there is significant text surrounding the word, it has been translated ‘return’ by DSSEL, except in CD 19:16. Obviously, ‘repentance’ or ‘conversion’ includes a ‘return’, i.e. a return to God. But why did the writer use this term at all? I believe that it is a play on the sense of the following expression, so that the whole might perhaps be better translated, ‘... for they entered into a covenant of turning [away from sin and to God], but they did not turn away from the way of treachery’ (*כי באו ... בברית*) (*תשובה* ולא סרו מדרך בוגדים; CD 19:16-17, my translation). The writer’s point is that though these people purported to turn to God, they had not done so in practice. Theirs was an outward confession only, as evidenced by the fact that they kept to their old sinful ways.

Next, the writer seems to draw a parallel between the ‘princes of Judah’ and those of the members of his community who failed to remain faithful to their covenant commitments. He continues to describe the heinousness of their apostasy by noting that they refused to stop mixing with the people (*עם*; i.e. outsiders, possibly including gentiles) and their sins (CD 19:20-21; CD 8:8 does not include ‘their sins’) and thus continued rebelling against God. The author’s highly allegorical interpretation of a quotation from Deuteronomy 32:33⁴⁷³ highlights this even more: the rulers of the peoples (possibly gentiles) are likened to serpents, the wine to their [wicked] ways (DSSEL has ‘customs’), and the cobra’s (or asp’s) poison to the ‘head of the kings of Greece, who comes upon them to execute vengeance’ (cf. the comments on 8:9-11).

⁴⁷² Of these, at least one occurrence is in a rather fragmentary text; three are in 1QH, one in 4QH.

⁴⁷³ ‘Their wine is the venom of serpents, and the deadly poison of cobras’ (NASB). DSSSE: ‘Their wine is serpents’ venom and cruel poison of asps.’

The writer then continues to castigate the ‘builders of the wall’ (apparently former members of the community) who have fallen for the lies of ‘one who follows the wind, weighs storms and preaches lies to mankind’ (CD 19:24b-26a), and notes that the judgment of those among his community who fail to remain faithful to their covenant vows will be like that, too. He reminds his readers of God’s election grace (quoting from Deuteronomy 9:5 and 7:8) when he chose their forefathers in the desert, not because of any merit they might have had but simply because he loved them. Those who follow in the footsteps of the faithful are also loved by God because ‘to them belongs the fathers’ covenant’ (CD 19:30-31: *כי להם ברית אבות*; cf. the comments on 8:18). Once again it appears that the writer equates the members of his community with those of the Sinai covenant.

In the next few lines the writer returns to the theme of how those who forsake their covenant obligations will fare. He notes that ‘all the men who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus and turned and betrayed and departed from the well of living waters, shall not be counted in the assembly of the people, they shall not be inscribed in their lists’ (DSSSE, CD 19:33-35; Hebrew quotation from DSSSEL: *כן כל האנשים אשר באו בברית החדשה (בארץ דמשק ושבו ויבגדו ויסורו מבאר מים החיים לא יחשבו בסוד עם בכתבם לא יכתבו*). Here the reference is obviously not to the Sinai covenant, but to a ‘new covenant in the land of Damascus,’ however that is perceived (see below).

CD 20 continues the theme of the fate of apostates. Such persons face expulsion from the community, though it seems that this expulsion is not necessarily permanent, provided the apostate returns from his wicked ways (20:5). However, if he persists in his apostasy, he will not only be excluded but also ostracised, since none of the members of the community must have any dealings with him. He has become like one who never was part of the community, walking in idolatry⁴⁷⁴ and, having rejected their strict interpretation of the law, he has ‘rejected the covenant’ (CD 20:11-12; my translation; *ומאסו בברית*) ‘and the pact which they established in the land of Damascus, which is the new covenant’ (CD 20:12; *ואמנה אשר קימו בארץ דמשק והוא ברית החדשה*). The covenant here is obviously the sectarians’ vow to adhere to the Mosaic law according to their strict interpretation of it (see below for a more detailed interpretation). The writer continues to note that those who turn away from their initial commitment to the community, together with their families, will have ‘no portion’ in the ‘house of the law’ (CD 20:13).

⁴⁷⁴ Lit. ‘having set up idols upon their heart;’ CD 20:9 (*אשר שמו גלולים על לבם*). Wacholder (2007:245) aptly comments: ‘Anyone who has been accepted as a member, but goes on to reject the Torah shall be expelled as if he were one who had never joined. Being a member does not bestow upon anyone irrevocable privileges. Unless he repents and acts accordingly, such a person shall be excluded as if he were one who had never placed his fate with those who were instructed by God (20:3–6).’

The writer then states that the time from the unique Teacher's 'being gathered' (האסף, Niph inf cons; CD 20:14)⁴⁷⁵ to the destruction of the people who followed the 'Man of the Lie' will be about 40 years. He goes on to explain that 'God's anger will burn against Israel,' i.e. the whole nation, including her leaders, with the result that no righteous person will remain (CD 20:15b-17a). By quoting from Hosea 3:4⁴⁷⁶ the writer here likens the deserters of his community to those of the exodus generation (cf. Wacholder 2007:246). In contrast to those who are judged by God are 'those who repent from the rebellion of Jacob' (ושבי פשע יעקב) and have 'kept the covenant of God' (שמרו ברית אל; CD 20:17, my translation). It appears that the covenant here refers again to the Sinai covenant, but as interpreted by the writer's community. These 'penitents' or 'returnees' (שבי) exhort each other in the ways of God, with the result that God will write a book of remembrance concerning them (CD 20:18-19, quoting and expanding Mal 3:16) and that the difference between the righteous and the wicked will be known again (CD 20:20-21, quoting Mal 3:18), because God is faithful to those who are faithful to him (CD 20:22, quoting Ex 20:6).

The next occurrence of ברית is in CD 20:25 (using the phrase באי ברית) where the writer continues the theme of punishment for apostates. He notes that those among the people who 'entered the covenant' but who 'breached the boundaries of the law' (my translation; וכל אשר פרצו את גבול התורה מבאי הברית) will be excluded (lit. 'cut off') from the camp at the time of God's appearance in glory, while those who adhered to the teachings of the Teacher will receive forgiveness and experience deliverance (CD 20:25-34).⁴⁷⁷ The expression 'boundaries of the law' seems to indicate once again the sectarians' strict interpretation of the Mosaic covenant.

The last occurrence of the word ברית is in CD 20:29. Here the writer commends those who remain steadfast in their commitment to the covenant and who openly confess their transgressions against it. This they do in words reminiscent of the great biblical prayers of repentance such as Nehemiah 1 (esp. v. 6) and Daniel 9 (esp. vv. 5, 11, 15; CD 20:29 contains two words from Dn 9:15: חטאנו רשענו), but also 1 Kings 8 (esp. v. 47 // 2 Chr 6:37; cf. also Jr 3:25; Ps 106:6). The faithful in CD state that they have been 'walking contrary to the ordinances of the covenant' (CD 20:29; בקרי בחקי הברית) and,

⁴⁷⁵ This is usually interpreted to mean his death (DSSEL), but Wacholder (2007:164) suggests the interpretation 'assembling.' It is difficult to make a decision, but I tend to prefer the traditional view.

⁴⁷⁶ "Neither king nor prince" [Hs 3:4] nor judge nor one who exhorts to do what is right will be left; (DSSEL, CD 20:16-17).

⁴⁷⁷ The very fragmentary 4Q267 3:1-5 may be a parallel to CD 20:25-38, according to the reconstruction in DSSEL. The phrase בברית also appears in 4Q267 4:8, but it is an isolated word in a series of lines where only one or two words have been preserved, so it is difficult to establish the context where it appears. 4Q267 8 is parallel to 4Q266 7iii, but again the text is too fragmentary to make much sense of the context.

humbling themselves, submit to the teachings of the ‘Teacher of Righteousness.’ The context indicates that the covenant here is the strict interpretation of the law by the sect, especially as revealed to the Teacher.⁴⁷⁸ Those who do keep it are promised forgiveness and rejoicing (CD 20:29-34).

3.2.2.11 4Q269 9:4-8

Fragment 4Q269 9:4-8⁴⁷⁹ gives instructions to someone apparently wishing to marry a woman who has already had sexual relations. The writer instructs that such women must not be brought ‘into the holy covenant’ (אל יבא איש אשה בברייתך קודם אשר ידעה)⁴⁸⁰ (DSSSEL; partly reconstructed) unless she has been examined by ‘reliable women’ under the guidance of the מבקר. After such an examination has taken place and presumably been satisfactory, the man may take her. בריית here refers to the community’s interpretation of the Mosaic law. This instruction is obviously for such members who were or wanted to be married and presumably also lived in camps all over the country. It points to the fact that the community to which this fragment refers was not completely celibate and that women had a role to play in the sect. It is also interesting that the covenant here is termed ‘holy’, which is the only time that this designation is used in the examined DSS. Elsewhere there are two more references to a ‘holy covenant.’ The expression ‘his holy covenant’ appears in 1QS^b 1:2 in the context of blessings to be said by the Maskil over those who keep God’s ‘holy covenant.’ In 4Q415 2ii:4 the words ‘Lest thou (fem.) neglect thy hol[y] covenant’ (DSSSEL) are preserved, but the text is too fragmentary to allow any conclusions concerning the exact meaning. In the three instances where enough of the surrounding material is preserved, the reference is to the sectarian’s covenant. Whether or not an allusion to Daniel 11:28, 30 is in view is unclear, but as the contexts are so different, it is unlikely.

3.2.2.12 Excursus: The Expression ‘The New Covenant in the Land of Damascus’

CD alone among the Scrolls mentions the ‘new covenant in the land of Damascus’ (ברייתך בהדשה בארץ דמשק, prefixed either with the definite article or the preposition ב plus the definite article), a phrase which occurs three times (if one counts the fragment of 4Q269, four times): in CD 6:19 (paralleled in the fragmentary text 4Q269 (4QD^d) 4i:3); and 8:21

⁴⁷⁸ Nitzan (2001:95-96) observes that the ‘reward of “seeing God’s salvation,” promised to those who are faithful to the new covenant established by the Teacher of Righteousness (CD 20:31-34; cf. CD 7:4b-6a), confirms that this covenant is the eschatological covenant prophesied by Jeremiah,’ which, according to ‘the perception at Qumran,’ is ‘the correct system of observing the Law.’

⁴⁷⁹ DSSSEL lists the following parallels for this text: 4Q270 5:17ff; 4Q271 3; 4Q267 7.

⁴⁸⁰ Cf. also 4Q270 5:17 where the expression is used with the definite article: אל יבא איש אשה בברייתך הקודם אשר.

and its parallel, 19:33-34. Column 20:12 also refers to it, but not with this exact phrase. There the writer simply pronounces judgment on those who ‘turned round with insolent men, for they spoke falsehood about the just regulations and despised the covenant ... and the pact *which they established in the land of Damascus, which is the new covenant*’ (CD 20:10-12; DSSSE, italics added). The place name ‘Damascus’ only appears in CD,⁴⁸¹ with seven occurrences in manuscripts A and B, and ten in 4Q fragments. The phrase ‘new covenant’ also occurs in the Habakkuk peshar (1QpHab 2:3), but in a reconstructed line where the word ברית is not legible. For the present purpose, only the occurrences in CD will be examined, but first of all, the connection with Jeremiah 31:31-34 will be considered, in particular regarding what ‘new covenant’ means in that context. Then the significance of Damascus will be explored, and lastly the contexts in CD where הברית דמשק appears will be discussed in detail.

3.2.2.12.1 The ‘New Covenant’ in Jeremiah

The expression ברית החדשה occurs only once in the HB, in Jeremiah 31:31-32:⁴⁸² ‘Behold, days are coming, declares YHWH, when I will make with the house of Israel and the house of Judah a new covenant (הנה ימים באים באם-יהוה וכרתי את-בית ישראל ואת-בית יהודה ברית) (תדקשה). It will not be like the covenant I made with their (fore)fathers in the day I took them by the hand and brought them out of the land of Egypt, the covenant which they broke, though I was a husband to them’ (לא כברית אשר כרתי את-אבותם ביום ההוא ואת-בית ישראל ואת-בית יהודה ברית) (תדקשה).⁴⁸³ The content of this new covenant is outlined in the next verse: ‘For this is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel after these days ... I will put my Torah in their innermost parts [NASB ‘minds’], and I will write it upon their hearts, and I will be their God and they shall be my people’ (my translation). Moreover, each person will know God personally (and intimately) and God will forgive (סלח) all their sins (Jr 31:34-35).

What does it mean that this covenant is *new*? In the OT, the word חדש ‘can have both the sense of “renew”, as it does in Lam. 3:22-23, and “brand new”, as it does in Exod. 1.8, Deut. 32.17, and 1 Sam. 6.7’ (Freedman & Miano 2003:23). Freedman and Miano (2003:23) argue that in the context of Jeremiah 31 either of these categories ‘would be too

⁴⁸¹ Seventeen times, based on a word search in DSSSE; four of these in the expression under examination.

⁴⁸² It is curious that CD never quotes directly from Jeremiah 31. Nitzan (2001:95) suggests, quite plausibly, that this is perhaps because ‘the connection was obvious to everyone in the community,’ and that despite the failure to directly refer to Jeremiah the ‘identification with the eschatological covenant is evident in the historical survey of CD 3:12b-16a where the covenant based on the revealed interpretation of God’s commandments is considered a replacement for the earlier covenant that was broken by the generations of the First Temple period (3:10b-12a).’ See also above on CD 3.

⁴⁸³ Note the emphatic position of the phrase ‘not like the covenant with their fathers.’

narrow a view.’ They suggest that ‘a little of both [is] involved. On the one hand, Jeremiah is clearly looking forward to something radically different from past reforms’ (Freedman & Miano 2003:23), especially as he had seen Josiah’s reforms fail. However, he also ‘could see no other law but one. To him God did not change his standards; his Law was his law’ (Freedman & Miano 2003:23). The newness of Jeremiah’s covenant is, therefore, not in *content*, but in the way in which it will operate (cf. von Rad 1993:221; Linington 2003a:274), namely from an inner compulsion brought about by God himself⁴⁸⁴ (cf. Weinfeld 1975:277), not mere outward adherence to rules and regulations (though this is obviously not lacking). God will ‘write his laws’ on the human heart, as he had written them earlier, at Mt Sinai, in stone. Moreover, the basis of the new covenant is that God will forgive (סלח)⁴⁸⁵ his people (cf. Potter 1983:350) – past sinfulness will be removed and forgotten (Jr 31:34; cf. Dn 9:24), and thus a new relationship between God and his people will be possible (‘I will be their God and they shall be my people,’ Jr 31:33, NASB).

3.2.2.12.2 The Expression ‘In the Land of Damascus’

The expression ‘in the land of Damascus,’ and in particular the reference to Damascus, must be examined next. In the HB, the name ‘Damascus’ appears 43 times, usually indicating the city (or city-state) in what is modern-day Syria, and what was Aram in biblical times. In 1 Kings 11:23-25 we read about a certain Rezon who fled from his master Hadadezer, king of Zobah, during the time when David destroyed Zobah’s army. He went to Damascus, settled there with a band of men and became king there. In this context, while certainly referring to the city state, Damascus also appears to be a place of exile and/or refuge, seen in a rather positive sense. Most of the time, however, Damascus was considered to be a place hostile to Israel and/or Judah, though occasionally it was allied with them and sometimes was even part of the extended empire (cf. 2 Ki 14:28). Damascus is included in the prophecies of judgment against the nations in Isaiah 17, Jeremiah 49 and Amos 1.

⁴⁸⁴ Westermann (1997:396) rightly observes: ‘That this new covenant concerns the behavior of an individual (v 33) is distinctive and unique to Jer 31:31–34.’ Potter (1983:350) notes that in contrast to Deuteronomy where the emphasis was on people’s efforts to learn and teach God’s word (cf. Dt 6:6), Jeremiah envisages that ‘God will give direct, intuitive knowledge of his law’ to his people by writing it himself ‘upon men’s hearts, and no longer will others be able to falsify it. No one will teach it, not one will be able, by his superior expertise, to use it to his own advantage’ (Potter 1983:353).

⁴⁸⁵ The word is a term only used for God’s forgiveness of human sin and implies complete and comprehensive forgiveness about which there is no doubt whatsoever (Mulzac 1996:246). סלח therefore ‘suggests that only by divine innovation could such a sin problem be effectively resolved’ (Mulzac 1996:246).

In the DSS, references to Damascus only appear in the Damascus Document, a total of twelve times.⁴⁸⁶ The reference in CD 7:15, 19 (4Q266 3iii:20) comes in connection with a quotation from Amos 5:26-27. CD 7:14-15 reads: כאשר אמר והגליתי את סכות מלככם ואת כיון צלמיכם מאהלי דמשק (‘as it says: “And I will exile the Sikkut [booths of] your king, and the Kiyyun [foundations of] your images from/beyond the tents of Damascus;” my translation, but cf. DSSSE & DSSEL). The writer goes on to identify the ‘Sikkuth, your king’ as ‘the books of the law’ (CD 7:15-16) and ‘Kiyyun, your images’ as ‘the books of the prophets whose words Israel despised’ (CD 7:17-18) but does not explain or qualify Damascus in any way. He only notes that ‘the star is the interpreter of the law who comes to Damascus’ (CD 7:18-19, referring to the prophecy of Balaam in Nu 24:17; cf. Collins 2010a:30), which may or may not indicate the actual city or area in modern-day Syria. Does Amos give any hints?

Amos 5:26-27 reads: ‘You also carried along Sikkuth your king and Kiyyun, your images, the star of your gods which you made for yourselves. Therefore, I will make you go into exile beyond Damascus’ (NASB). Here God sends the people into exile because of their idol worship. Damascus is seen as a place of exile. It is not a place of refuge but of punishment and discipline. It is possible that the writer of CD refers to this identification when he mentions ‘the new covenant in the land of Damascus.’ For him, it appears, Damascus is not a specific city or place, but simply a metaphor for separation, ‘of withdrawal from the rest of Jewish society’ (Collins 2010a:30).

Can this be supported from elsewhere? Jeremiah considered those who were in exile as good whereas those who remained in Judah (and Jerusalem) were considered bad (Jr 24:4-10). God announces to Jeremiah that the exiles were under his protective eye and that he would ultimately bring them back to their land (Jr 24:5-6). Moreover, and more pertinent to our expression, God promises that he ‘will give them a heart to know me, that I am the LORD. They will be my people, and I will be their God, for they will return to me with all their heart’ (Jr 24:7, NIV). In other words, the exile will have a refining influence on the people. Jeremiah’s letter to the exiles (Jr 29) confirms this. After telling the exiles that they must settle down since the exile will last a long time, he encourages them, saying that after seventy years God will visit them again and have mercy on them. ‘Then you will call upon Me and come and pray to Me, and I will listen to you. You will seek Me and find Me when you search for Me with all your heart’ (Jr 29:12-13, NASB; the relevant part of v 13 reads in MT בְּקוֹשְׁתֵם אֶתִּי וּמִצְאֵתֶם נִי תִדְרְשׁוּנִי בְּכָל־לְבַבְכֶם). This passage includes the word דרש, an important term not only in CD, but other DSS as well. The exiles will be those

⁴⁸⁶ CD 6:5, 19; 7:15, 19 = 4Q266 3iii:20; 8:21; 19:34; 20:12; 4Q266 3ii:12, 25; 4Q267 2:12; 4Q269 4ii:1; 5:2.

who 'seek' YHWH, and he will in turn reveal himself to them. That, according to CD (1:10; 6:6-7; 7:18), was the purpose of those who 'entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus.' It is therefore feasible that the expression does not refer to the actual city (though this is not precluded either), but that it is a metaphorical term used to refer to the place where members of the initial community went as they separated themselves from others less committed to the Torah to earnestly study the law in order to please God.

In CD where Damascus is referred to outside of the phrase 'covenant in the land of Damascus,' it seems to denote a real place (cf. CD 6:5; 7:15 [Am 5:26-27]; 7:19; 20:12). Whether or not this place is literal Damascus or a simply a label for another place is debatable. Scholarly opinion on this issue varies. Wacholder (2007:9-10) for example takes the references to Damascus in CD literally and argues that the sectarians literally went into exile to the city of Damascus.⁴⁸⁷ Others believe it is a code name for Qumran (Jaubert 1958:226; Milikowski 1982:106) or the 'desert of Qumran' (Cross 1995:72; Schiffman 2010b:462). However, in line with the arguments presented above, it appears that most scholars 'prefer a metaphorical interpretation' whereby 'Damascus means a symbolic place, in terms of it being a symbol of refuge' (Christiansen 1998:78). Regev (2007:46) considers Damascus an 'interim space' in which the members of the community are segregated from outsiders to observe the law. According to his definition it is 'a place free of corruption, where the new covenant is made.' Christiansen (1998:78) understands Damascus 'as a *place* defined by its *holiness*' (italics added). However, Damascus, as has been shown, is never considered a place of *holiness* in the HB. On the contrary, most of the time Damascus is associated with Israel's enemies, and in Amos as a place of exile and punishment. While God used the exile to bring his people to repentance, and considered the exiled people as holy, this does not imply that the land of exile itself was considered holy. In fact, it seems that the opposite was the case. Generally land outside Israel was considered unclean (Am 7:17; Hos 9:3; though admittedly this last scripture refers to exile in Assyria, not Babylon or Damascus; however, cf. Ezk 4:13 which does, by implication, refer to exile in Babylon). Therefore I believe it is more accurate to assert that 'Damascus' was seen as a place of exile and/or refuge, rather than a place of holiness, especially considering that the writer was well versed in the Hebrew Scriptures. The exile did, however, produce in the people a greater awareness of the necessity for holiness, which in the mind of the writer of CD is achieved by exact obedience to the laws of Moses as interpreted by his community.

⁴⁸⁷ Similarly, already in 1969 Iwry had argued that 'the evidence both in the [Damascus] Document and elsewhere points ... to a *return* to Judea on the part of a group of new covenanters from the Jewish diaspora in Syria at some time during the early Hasmonean period' (Iwry 1969:80; italics his).

In my opinion, the most convincing position regarding the meaning of ‘Damascus’ in CD is that by Rabinowitz (1954:17, n. 20b) and others who believe that the reference is to the exile of the Jews, i.e. Babylon. Davies (1982a:122-123) takes it for granted that the reference to Damascus ‘is used as a symbol of Babylon⁴⁸⁸ (or the Assyro-Babylonian captivity), since this interpretation is demanded by the context.’ He suggests further that it can be shown that the roots of the community are to be found in the exile, both theologically and historically, a suggestion that goes against the view that the community originated in the second century BCE (Davies 1982a:123; cf. also Davies 1990b, esp. pp. 509-519).

Hultgren (2007:96) also argues that for CD ‘the land of Damascus’ is ‘the land of Israel’s exile, specifically Babylon.’ The place of exile in the Bible is often considered the ‘land of the north,’ from which, according to the prophetic literature (e.g. Jr 1:14-16; Ezk 38:15) both the enemy as well as deliverance (Is 41:25; 43:6; Jr 3:18) will come. Hultgren (2007:96) therefore suggests that behind the expression ‘the land of Damascus’ in CD lies the phrase ‘the land of the north,’ especially as it appears in Jeremiah 31:8.⁴⁸⁹ Furthermore, the interpretation of Babylon as the land of exile is also supported by Acts 7:43 where Stephen uses Amos 5:26-27, but has ‘I will send you into exile beyond *Babylon*’ (NIV, italics added) instead of Amos’s ‘Damascus’ (Murphy-O’Connor 1985:225; Davies 1990b:511f; Hultgren 2007:97). This connection is thus not just a modern scholarly one, but was already made in ancient times (Hultgren 2007:97). Hultgren (2007:97) goes on to suggest that the ‘most likely explanation for the connection ... is simply that the members of the Damascus covenant read Amos 5:26-27 as a prophecy that the law and the prophets would be restored, and their true interpretation revealed, in the exile.’⁴⁹⁰

⁴⁸⁸ So also Murphy-O’Connor (1974:221) who says that “‘Damascus,’ ... is a symbolic name for Babylon’ (cf. Knibb 1983:100; Murphy-O’Connor 1985:225f).

⁴⁸⁹ The Amos midrash in CD 7:12b-14a (‘When the two houses of Israel separated, Ephraim detached itself from Judah, and all the renegades were delivered up to the sword; but those who remained steadfast escaped to the land of the north’) supports this clearly as it ‘identifies the “land of the north” (the land of exile) with Damascus,’ which explains the origin of the expression ‘the new covenant in the land of Damascus’ (Hultgren 2007:96-97).

⁴⁹⁰ Hultgren traces this whole development ‘back to Deuteronomistic circles in the exilic or post-exilic period’ due to the ‘scribal activity on and exegetical connections between Deuteronomistic texts such as Deut. 4:25-31; 29; 30:1-5; and Jer 39-31, as well as Amos 5:26-27.’ Additionally, he observes that ‘[u]nderlying the expression “the new covenant in the land of Damascus” is a coherent and comprehensive Deuteronomistic theology according to which a “new covenant” in the “land of the north” (=the exile) is prerequisite for the restoration of Israel’ with Jeremiah 30-31 as ‘the linchpin of the whole idea’ (Hultgren 2007:103). Hultgren (2007:103) concludes that the ‘new covenant included the study of the law and the prophets to find the correct interpretation of the law, so as to be able to do the revealed and hidden things of the law.’

For more options and views regarding what ‘Damascus’ in CD means see Harvey (2001:21ff). Davies (1982a:16-17) gives a useful summary of the three major views. He addresses the issue in more detail in ‘The Birthplace of the Essenes: Where is “Damascus”?’ (Davies 1990b).

3.2.2.12.3 The Use of the Expression ‘The New Covenant in the Land of Damascus’ in CD

Now the four passages in CD that contain the phrase ‘the new covenant in the land of Damascus’ and the ‘new covenant’ in CD 20:12 can be considered to see whether the observations made so far can be sustained.

3.2.2.12.3.1 *The Expression ‘New Covenant in the land of Damascus’ in CD 6:19 & 4Q269 (4QD^d) 4i:3*

The first occurrence in CD 6:19⁴⁹¹ appears in connection with the instructions to those who ‘have been brought into the covenant’ (line 11; ... (וכל אשר הובאו בברית...)) ... ‘according to what was discovered by those who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus’ (line 19: ... (כמצאת באי הברית החדשה בארץ דמשק)).⁴⁹² In between these lines, and following the words just cited in line 19, the members of the community are instructed to be very careful to live according to the ‘exact interpretation of the law for the age of wickedness’ (CD 6:14), and a list of examples is given as to what this entails, such as abstaining from wicked wealth in any form, from false worship at the temple⁴⁹³ etc. It seems from the way that ‘those who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus’ are mentioned, that they are a different group from the present addressees who are exhorted to live according to their findings and their interpretation of the law. ‘Those who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus’ are, in other words, the predecessors of the present addressees (cf. Hultgren 2007:58).⁴⁹⁴ The writer and his addressees considered themselves ‘as standing in continuity with the older “new covenant in the land of Damascus”’ and ‘viewed [themselves] as the true heir[s] of [that] new covenant’ (cf. Hultgren 2007:58).

⁴⁹¹ The parallel to CD 6:19ff, fragment 4Q269 (4QD^d) 4i:3, is very fragmentary indeed. It starts: ‘[the] ne[w (covenant) in the lan[d of Damascus, to offer up the holy things] according to their interpretations’ (lines 1-2a, DSSEL), and continues for 7 lines similar to CD 6:19-7:3. Only very few words are complete, and most of the text has been supplemented from CD 6:19-7:3. Therefore this fragment is of little value in establishing the meaning of the phrase ‘the new covenant in the land of Damascus.’

⁴⁹² Murphy-O’Connor (1971a:211) divides CD 6:2-8:3 into two sections, i.e. 6:2-11a and 6:11b-8:3. He further subdivides CD 6:11b-8:3 into a ‘list of precepts (VI, 11b-VII, 4)’ and a ‘hortatory epilogue (VII, 4-VIII, 3).’ He considers the former, to which CD 6:19 belongs, a ‘memorandum’ (Murphy-O’Connor 1971a:216; an identification accepted also by Hultgren 2007:116) which is based on the Holiness Code of Leviticus 17-26.

⁴⁹³ There has been some debate over the meaning of this text. Some think it means that the community separated itself from worship in the temple (e.g. Hultgren 2007:118), but the following words seem to preclude this. They only were not to participate in false worship (see my interpretation on the Malachi reference above; cf. Davies 1982b:298ff). Indeed, later in the same document the use of the temple seems presupposed (e.g. CD 11:18-19). Hultgren (2007:118) suggests that the milieu for CD 6:11b-7:4a is ‘different from the rest of CD and closer to Qumran,’ though it ‘does not have to be the Qumran community itself.’ Therefore he believes that the milieu for CD 6:11b-7:4a was ‘an interim period between the time when a segment or a community from within the covenant behind D began to separate itself from the temple and the time of final separation and move to the desert.’

⁴⁹⁴ Hultgren (2007:58) rightly observes that ‘the “covenant” group that decided to boycott the temple ... confirms its allegiance to the halakah of “the new covenant in the land of Damascus,” that is, the halakah that is preserved in D,’ and states that this Damascus covenant ‘was a group or movement that *preceded* the existence of the “covenant” that decided to boycott the temple,’ as is also evident from CD 6:12-14a.

In the wider context, CD 6:3-11 speaks about ‘princes’ (identified as ‘the penitents⁴⁹⁵ of Israel who depart from the land of Judah and dwell in the land of Damascus,’ DSSEL) who ‘dug a well’ (identified as the Torah; this is an allusion to Numbers 21:18). They are called ‘princes’ because they ‘sought’ (דרש) God and decided to follow his commandments strictly according to the teachings of one מחוקק⁴⁹⁶ (perhaps a reference to the Teacher of Righteousness⁴⁹⁷ or, more likely, a predecessor of his?) who interpreted (דרש) the law for the people. This use of דרש is interesting as it seems to indicate that the one who diligently ‘seeks’ God in the law is also able to ‘interpret’ it properly, follow its commandments strictly, and teach others accordingly.⁴⁹⁸

CD 6:12-14 continues to state that those who have been ‘brought into the covenant’ were not to go into the (Jerusalem) temple and take part in its worship unless they followed the ‘exact (requirements of) the Torah’ (Baumgarten & Schwartz 1995:23) and separated themselves from those who did not do so (who are called ‘sons of the pit’ בני השחת, Baumgarten & Schwartz 1995:23). Part of this separation involved distinguishing between pure and impure, keeping the Sabbath ‘in its exact detail’ (Baumgarten & Schwartz 1995:25, translation of CD 6:18) as well as the appointed fast day ‘as it was found by those who entered into the new covenant in the land of Damascus’ (CD 6:19). Once again, the reference here seems to be to a group preceding the present addressees of

⁴⁹⁵ Or perhaps ‘the returnees,’ as suggested by Iwry (1969:86), who argues that the expression שבי ישראל ‘means simply and correctly “the returnees of Israel, i.e., those of Israel who have returned home”,’ who hail from or originate in the pre-exilic land of Judah.’ He believes that these people ‘had sojourned during their exile in Damascus,’ rather than Babylon (Iwry 1969:86). Later on, he argues that ‘the Jewish settlement in Damascus was the oldest outside of Palestine,’ and that the fact that CD refers to Ezekiel as its ‘source of inspiration’ proves his thesis (Iwry 1969:88). However, it appears to me that reference to Ezekiel more likely indicates a Babylonian than Syrian provenance.

⁴⁹⁶ There is a delightful pun on the root חקק in CD 6:9, which is used three times in different forms (במחוקקות אשר חקק) (the verb חקק means ‘to inscribe, decree;’ the noun מחוקקות means ‘rule, statute’ according to the DSSEL dictionary; HALOT defines the verb as ‘hew out; scratch, mark; decree, specify’). The whole phrase can be literally translated ‘by/with the decrees that were decreed by the one who decrees.’ Davies (1982a:117) considers this wordplay almost ‘cumbersome’ but it certainly serves to prove the writer’s point by repetition and so confirmation. CD 6:10 states that apart from diligently keeping these decrees nothing can be achieved ‘in the age of wickedness’ until the coming of ‘the one who will teach righteousness’ (CD 6:11). Incidentally, this line seems to confirm that the מחוקק cannot be the Teacher of Righteousness himself, since it still anticipates his coming. Cf. Davies (1982a:123-24) who thinks that ‘the one who will teach righteousness’ in this line is not the Teacher of Righteousness, but another (historically unidentifiable) future figure.

⁴⁹⁷ So Murphy-O’Connor (1971a:230); see previous note.

⁴⁹⁸ A lexical study on דרש in both the HB and the DSS shows that in the DSS דרש is preferred over בקש to express the idea of seeking God with the intention to do his will. דרש can mean ‘caring about’ someone or something, as well as ‘inquire (of), consult, seek, require (of), study, investigate, examine, ask’ (Denninger 1997:993; cf. HALOT). דרש implies intentionality, sincerity and desire for relationship (cf. Denninger 1997:996), i.e. a ‘longing’ (McConville 1986:105; cf. Denninger 1997:997) and ‘striving to cleave to the Lord directly’ (McCarthy 1982:31; cf. Denninger 1997:997). This, I believe, is also the case in the DSS, especially in CD and IQS where the word is often used to express the idea of seeking God. It is an important word in relation to covenant since one of the prerequisites for joining the community was that a person should ‘seek God wholeheartedly’ (lit. ‘with all his heart and soul;’ IQS 1:1). In the HB, ‘[s]eeking [the Lord] is [the] privilege and responsibility of ... the covenant community,’ whereas ‘[n]eglecting to seek Yahweh or seeking elsewhere breaks his covenant’ and is, in fact, sin (Denninger 1997:995). The result of seeking the Lord is that he will be found (2 Chr 15:2). In the DSSEL dictionary the meanings of דרש are given as ‘to seek, examine, interpret.’ There is, therefore, an extension of the meaning in the DSS to include ‘interpretation’ that is not yet apparent in biblical usage.

the writer, who is exhorting his own compatriots to follow their example (see CD 7:1ff). CD 6:19 also indicates that what was important for the community was to follow the law exactly according to the interpretation of ‘those who entered into the new covenant in the land of Damascus.’⁴⁹⁹

3.2.2.12.3.2 *The Expression ‘New Covenant in the land of Damascus’ in CD 8:21*

The second occurrence of the phrase ‘new covenant in the land of Damascus’ is in CD 8:21, which appears after a *vacat* at the end of the column in an incomplete sentence (כל (האנשים אשר באו בברית החדשה בארץ דמשק) that does not continue either into column 9 (which follows column 8 in Manuscript A) or into column 15 (as in DSSSE). The translator of DSSEL interprets CD 8:21 thus: ‘*So it is with* all the men who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus’ (italics added). Column 9 starts a new section of regulations, the first of which concerns the devotion of a human being to the ban (יהורים). Such a person ‘shall be put to death according to the laws of the gentiles’ (DSSEL). This is followed by regulations concerning people who bear grudges against each other that do not help in the interpretation of the phrase ‘new covenant in the land of Damascus’ which precedes it logically in manuscript A of CD. An even greater inconsistency applies if columns 15-16 are inserted after CD 8. CD 15 begins by noting that someone must not ‘sw]ear by Aleph and Lamed ... nor by Aleph and Daleth ... but by the oath of the youths, by the curses of the covenant.’ This too does not help in the interpretation of the expression ‘new covenant in the land of Damascus.’ The only way to examine the phrase is therefore the preceding context.

The passage preceding CD 8:21 compares and contrasts those who keep God’s covenant with those who fall away from it. CD 8 continues from CD 7 by noting that those ‘entering his covenant but who do not remain steadfast’ in keeping its rules (CD 8:1-2, DSSSE) will be ‘visited for destruction at the hand of Belial’ (CD 8:2, DSSSE). The writer

⁴⁹⁹ Hultgren (2007:116) argues that CD 6:19 ‘is the oldest of the four places’ where the phrase ‘the new covenant in the land of Damascus’ is mentioned, and that this line ‘belongs to a pre-Qumran document,’ whereas the other three places where the phrase occurs ‘stand in texts composed after the rise of the Qumran community (or the community that eventually settled at Qumran).’ He considers it possible that the concept goes back to ‘Deuteronomistic circles, perhaps as far back as the exile’ (Hultgren 2007:119), though it might have arisen later, ‘for example, at the time of the Chronicler’ (Hultgren 2007:119). However, he then qualifies this statement by noting that in CD the use of the phrase ‘cannot be traced back any farther than the interim period during which the separatist movement that would eventually become the Qumran community arose’ (Hultgren 2007:119), though he does not exclude the possibility that the term itself or the community that was so named may go back further. As pointed out in note 490 above, he suggests that the milieu for CD 6:11b-7:4a is ‘an interim period between the time when a segment or a community from within the covenant behind D began to separate itself from the temple and the time of final separation and move to the desert.’

continues to state that the ‘princes of Judah’ (or ‘those who departed from Judah,’⁵⁰⁰ see Hultgren 2006:40) would be judged severely because they refused to leave ‘the path of traitors’ and thus ‘defiled themselves in paths of licentiousness’ (CD 8:4-5). Instead of separating themselves from common Jewry, they ‘did what was right’ in their own eyes (CD 8:7) and followed the ways of the gentiles (as implied by CD 8:9-11), in particular the Greeks.⁵⁰¹ The writer implies that these people have been deceived by one who ‘weighs wind and preaches lies’ to them (CD 8:13), but this deception does not mean they will escape judgment. The writer seems to speak about people in his own community (contra Murphy-O’Connor 1972b:207) who entered the covenant with the others, but then fell away and refused to follow the strict rules of the community any longer. On the other hand, those who did continue in the way of the community are the ones who are loved by God just as their predecessors who first endeavoured to please God in this way (CD 8:16-18). However, the writer continues his warning to his contemporaries that those who do not follow these strict rules but ‘forsake them and move aside in the stubbornness of their heart’ (CD 8:19) will receive similar judgment from God as that mentioned previously.

CD 8:20 contains an enigmatic reference: ‘This is the word which Jeremiah spoke to Baruch, son of Neriah, and Elishah to Gehazi his servant’ (DSSSE). It seems to refer to the judgment just threatened, and the reference is apparently to Elisha’s condemnation of Gehazi when he went after Naaman to get some of the reward that Elisha had refused to take from Naaman when he was healed from his leprosy (2 Ki 5, esp. vv 26-27). Jeremiah’s words to Baruch are probably the words recorded in Jeremiah 45:5: ‘But you, are you seeking great things for yourselves? Do not seek them; for behold, I am going to bring disaster on all flesh’ (NASB). Davies (1982a:171-72) makes the same connection and suggests that it was brought about by the word קבץ, ‘cling,’ which is the same as that used in CD 8:4, and is ‘possibly ... a misplaced gloss,’⁵⁰² but he finds it difficult to see Baruch as an unfaithful servant, and therefore suggests that it is impossible to decide whether ‘this passage is a fragment of [a] larger statement about treacherous servants or a gloss’ (Davies 1982a:172).

Unlike Davies I do not think this is just an independent insertion by the redactor, but that, even if it was inserted later than other material surrounding it, it was purposefully

⁵⁰⁰ This translation as defended by Hultgren (2007:12-29; 40) makes sense in the context. Murphy-O’Connor (1972b:206-207) takes the translation ‘princes of Judah’ for granted and suggests that the text is directed against religious leaders in general, not members of the writer’s community, either past or present. He quotes Stegemann (1971:167), who remarks that the reference to the Scriptures and the terminology used in CD hint at the political leaders in Jerusalem in general (cf. Murphy-O’Connor 1972b:207-208).

⁵⁰¹ Murphy-O’Connor (1972b:203) notes that this is ‘a generic statement of the pernicious effect of Hellenistic influence in Palestine.’

⁵⁰² 2 Kings 5:27: ‘Therefore, the leprosy of Naaman shall cling (קבץ) to you and to your descendants forever’ (NASB); CD 8:4: ‘the defect sticks (קבץ) (to them)’ (DSSSE).

done by the redactor/writer. The words of Jeremiah to Baruch were words of warning to a would-be defector, whereas the words of Elisha to Gehazi those to an actual defector. Baruch took the warning seriously and was rewarded with his life, but Gehazi was beyond salvation. In my opinion, the writer of CD uses these two examples to warn his compatriots to avoid the example of Gehazi, but rather take heed and remain faithful like Baruch,⁵⁰³ for those among them who defected from those who entered ‘the new covenant in the land of Damascus’ (CD 8:21) would certainly not escape God’s judgment. What this judgment entails is not clearly stated. Hultgren (2007:43) suggests that CD 7:9-8:18b ‘deals with eschatological judgment, whereas’ CD 8:18c-19 ‘begins a new stage in the development of the document, treating of judgment within the community,’ and he may well be correct. The point is that line 21 makes sense in this context as a concluding remark, just as the translator of DSSEL suggests. Those ‘who enter the new covenant in the land of Damascus’ here, then, are, in my opinion, the writer’s contemporaries, who have accepted the strict interpretation of the law by their predecessors. He warns them against defection and apostasy. The expression ‘new covenant in the land of Damascus’ is a reference to these predecessors.⁵⁰⁴

3.2.2.12.3.3 *The Expression ‘New Covenant in the land of Damascus’ in CD 19:33-34*

The last occurrence of the phrase ‘the new covenant in the land of Damascus’ is in CD 19:33-34 which is parallel to CD 8:21. CD 19 is almost identical to CD 8, but there are some significant changes which are worthy of note. As in CD 8, CD 19:33-34 comes at the end of a section where the writer denounces people who, after purportedly repenting, have refused to actually leave their wicked ways and love of wealth. They will face the wrath of God, and the same will also be the fate of those members of his own community who ‘entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus’ but failed to adhere to the strict interpretation of the law by the group. It is interesting that CD 19 does not include the reference to Jeremiah that appears in CD 8:20. After denouncing those who ‘turn to the stubbornness of their own heart’ by refusing to accept God’s laws the writer immediately notes that ‘thus will it be for all the men who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus but turned away and became traitors and turned aside from the well of living water’ (CD 19:33). Indeed, those who do not adhere to God’s rules as interpreted by the writer’s community will ‘not be considered in the secret counsel of the people nor will

⁵⁰³ Cf. above on CD 7-9.

⁵⁰⁴ Alternatively, one might consider the phrase ‘All the men who enter the new covenant in the land of Damascus’ (my translation; CD 8:21) a new sentence, since it comes after a blank in the line. In this case, the parallel in CD 19:33-34 could be used to establish the meaning, assuming that a similar context would have followed in the missing column(s).

they be written down in their written records from the day of the gathering of the beloved/unique teacher until the rising up of the messiah from Aaron and from Israel' (CD 19:34-20:1 – my translation, reading יחידה). This appears to be a warning against following actual apostates at the time of writing, not just would-be ones as in CD 8, though of course the text there seems to be incomplete. This in turn would suggest a different time or at least place when (or where) CD 19-20 was written from that of CD 8; a time (and/or place) when the possibility of apostasy for members of the writer's community had become reality, and the writer felt it necessary to issue severe warnings against following such apostates to the still faithful members. That this is the case is also obvious from the following text in CD 20:1ff where the writer condemns those who entered the community, but then refused to fulfil the strict requirements of the law as interpreted by them.

The expression 'from the day of the gathering of the beloved teacher until the rising up of the messiah from Aaron and from Israel' is difficult to interpret. As it stands, it seems to indicate that after the appearance of the messiah from Aaron and from Israel, such people may yet have another chance of repentance and thus re-entry into the community on the authority of the Teacher of Righteousness who would permit such re-entry (cf. Murphy-O'Connor 1972a:546⁵⁰⁵). However, since this appearance is obviously viewed as a thing of the future, and I suggest the distant future, this is unlikely. According to Waltke and O'Connor (1990:215) the preposition עַד may express 'measure or degree ("as much as, as far as, even to, even unto"),' and perhaps such an interpretation is to be preferred in the present context: 'even unto the coming of the messiah from Aaron and Israel,' meaning in effect 'never.'⁵⁰⁶

⁵⁰⁵ However, Murphy-O'Connor (1972a:546) also notes that such a doctrine 'is completely at variance with the teachings of the Essene documents' and therefore suspects 'that something has happened to the text,' though what exactly is difficult to say, since even the Cave 4 documents do not throw any light on the problem. On the other hand, CD 6:10-11 seems to justify the interpretation of a second chance, in Murphy-O'Connor's opinion (1972a:546-47).

⁵⁰⁶ Davies (1982a:180) also finds it difficult to accept the idea of a second chance, and suggests that 'the only chance these men are offered is to accept the authority of the Teacher while he is still alive, and one may assume that the members of the Teacher's community did not believe that his death would predate the coming of the Messiah by any great length of time, since CD VI,11 explains that the "one who teaches righteousness" will arise "at the end of days."'

Hultgren (2007:48) accepts neither of these interpretations. Against Murphy-O'Connor he notes that the idea of a 'second chance' 'is directly contradicted by XIX,5b-14 only a few lines above' the present text. Furthermore, he presupposes that 'the term "new covenant" in CD ... refers to [a] pre-Qumran ... community' (Hultgren 2007:49). Connecting CD 3:15-17 and 4:4 with 6:2-11 and the present text, Hultgren (2007:51-52) thinks that the expression 'those who "departed from the well of living waters"' in 19:34 'are either those who turned away from the original "new covenant" movement before the Teacher arrived or those who (in the eyes of the Qumran community) turned away from the "new covenant" by not following the Teacher (cf. 1QpHab II,1-4) when he arrived.' Because of all this, he prefers a reading suggested by Schechter (1910:43), who translated CD 19:35 – 20:1 as follows: "They shall not be counted in the assembly of people, and in its writing they shall not be written." From the day when there was gathered in ^{20:1} the only teacher until there will arise the Anointed from Aaron and from Israel. And this is also the Law...' (cf. Hultgren 2007:53). Hultgren (2007:53) accepts the incomplete sentence created by the full stop between CD 19:35b and 35c, suggesting that it 'begins a new section,' just as 20:13b-14 which reads similarly, 'And

3.2.2.12.3.4 The Expression 'New Covenant' in CD 20:12

CD 20 continues to outline the 'judgment of everyone who enters the congregation of the men of perfect holiness and is slack in the fulfilment of the instructions of the upright' (CD 20:1-2, DSSSE). It is stated that such a person will be excommunicated (CD 20:3) and reproached publicly (CD 20:4-5), and none of the other members must have anything to do with him or have a share in his wealth (CD 20:6-7). On the contrary, such a man has been cursed by everyone in the community (CD 20:8). Anyone of a similar mind-set who rejects 'the former and the latter'⁵⁰⁷ (this probably referring to some laws not further specified) will face the same judgment and have 'no part in the house of the law' (CD 20:10). The next few lines set out the kind of things that lead to excommunication: speaking falsehood about the regulations of the community (CD 20:11) and otherwise despising the covenant which was 'established in the land of Damascus, which is the new covenant' (CD 20:12). Neither the traitor himself nor his family will have 'a part in the house of the law' (CD 20:13).

CD 20:10-12 reads: 'According to the judgment of their companions who returned⁵⁰⁸ with the men of mockery they shall be judged because they spoke error against the righteous laws and they rejected the covenant and agreement which they established in the land of Damascus, and that is the new covenant' (my translation; כמשפט רעיהם אשר שבו עם אנשי הלצון ישפטו כי דברו תועה על חקי הצדק ומאסו בברית } ואמנה אשר קימו בארץ דמשק והוא ברית החדשה).⁵⁰⁹ The 'they' are those who 'have set up idols upon their heart and walk in the stubbornness of their own hearts' (CD 20:9-10); in other words, they are apostates,⁵¹⁰

from the day (ומיום) of the gathering in (האסף) of the unique teacher (יורה היחיד) until (עד) the end of all the men of war....'

⁵⁰⁷ The Hebrew reads: וכמשפט הזה לכל המאס בראשונים ובאחרונים; DSSEL translates: 'Such is the fate for all who reject the commandments, whether old or new' (CD 20:8-9). Murphy-O'Connor (1972a:547) considers CD 20:8b-13b 'an intrusive element.' He suggests that the phrase 'the former and the latter' (CD 20:8) is the direct object of 'reject,' which he takes as an 'abbreviated title for ... the customary designation of a body of precepts' (Murphy-O'Connor 1972a:547-548). He proposes that the men described in CD 20:8b-13b are 'still ... members of the community ... but their attitude indicates that they have cut themselves off spiritually' (Murphy-O'Connor 1972a:549). Davies (1982a:182-183) points out that in Jubilees 1:26 the same phrase 'the first and the last' (= 'the former and the latter' in CD 20:8-9) is used. He argues that the 'former' or 'first' things here refer to the Torah, and the 'latter' or 'last' things to Jubilees (Davies 1982a:183), an argument that is taken up by Wacholder (2007:245-246). In my opinion Murphy-O'Connor's stance that the phrase refers to some body of precepts without necessarily stating what they consist of is preferable.

⁵⁰⁸ Murphy-O'Connor (1972a:549) cogently argues that there is in this text 'a play on the two senses of שוב, some of those who "returned" in a geographical sense (XIX, 34) "turned back" in a religious sense (XX, 10c).'

⁵⁰⁹ The word שוב is an important term associated with covenant, but suffice it to say here that I am not convinced by Murphy-O'Connor's argument that שוב [without a following preposition] is never used absolutely of complete negation of the covenant' (1972a:545). He suggests (following Rubinstein 1957:358) three possible meanings of the word: (a) "turned back" (from God), (b) "returned" (whence they came) and (c) "returned and..." – proposing the repetition of an action = "and again did..." (Murphy-O'Connor 1972a:545). He rules out meaning (a) because he says that in the OT שוב always appears with a preposition when it means conversion. However, in Jeremiah 4:1 שוב is used twice, the first time without a preposition, the second time with אל, but both, I believe, mean 'conversion,' i.e. a return to God by Israel: אִם-תָּשׁוּב יִשְׂרָאֵל וְנָאֵם יְהוָה אֵלַי תָּשׁוּב: "If you will return, o Israel," declares the Lord, "return to me."

⁵¹⁰ Davies (1982a:182) argues that CD 20:8b-13a is a critique of 'other apostates,' 'not the same group as XIX,33b-XX,1a.' He suggests that these are 'potential apostates' who as yet have only defected in mind, not physically

people who have stopped living according to the strict interpretation of the law as practised by the writer's community. The question that arises is of course why the writer should have found it necessary to use the explanatory phrase 'and that is the new covenant.' Perhaps it serves to make the warning even more urgent: since the writer's community considered themselves to be the descendants of the 'new' Damascus covenant, which those who had come out of the exile had established to prevent further judgments of God, how much more severely would apostates be judged who had joined this new covenant but failed to continue in it? To this effect, the writer repeats what he has stated earlier: neither those who fall away nor any of their family 'will have a part in the house of the Torah.'

Davies (1982a:176-177) considers the phrase 'which is the new covenant' as a gloss to explain the expression 'covenant in the land of Damascus' that precedes it more precisely. He suggests that since 'the word "new" was added as a necessary qualification of the original term, it follows that the new covenant *is not associated with Damascus in the same way as the original "Damascus covenant"*' (Davies 1982a:177, italics his). The new community 'continued to regard itself as the *true* community of the (original) Damascus covenant,' and 'the ancient nomenclature is retained in order to stress that this is not a different covenant, while at the same time the word "new" claims that it must not be equated strictly with the previous one, which has been superseded (or fulfilled) by the Teacher' (Davies 1982a:177). Thus he prefers the translation, 'new covenant-in-the-land-of-Damascus' (Davies 1982a:177). Davies thinks that the word 'new' was inserted because the sect condemned anyone who was at variance with the Teacher, after others had accepted his teachings (Davies 1982a:177), whereas originally those condemned belonged to the parent community (Davies 1982a:178).

Hultgren (2007:58) also argues 'that the "new covenant in the land of Damascus" ... was a group or movement that *preceded* the existence of the "covenant" that decided to boycott the temple,' whereas the 'covenant' group that decided to boycott the temple was a later group that 'viewed itself as standing in continuity with the older "new covenant in the land of Damascus"' as well as 'the true heir of the new covenant.' Unlike Davies, he does not think that the explanatory phrase 'that is the new covenant' in CD 20:12 is a gloss (and I think Hultgren is right). The phrase accurately describes the pact (אמנה) mentioned at the

(Davies 1982a:182), having 'rejected the former and the latter,' which he interprets as the 'teachings of the parent community' (the former) and 'those of the Teacher' (the latter) (Davies 1982a:183). Though he comments on the perceived ambiguity of the term 'the former' which may refer to the exodus generation of the Bible or to the parent community of the Qumran community before the rise of the Teacher of Righteousness, Davies (1982a:184) clearly prefers the latter option for the present context, and I think this is correct. However, I do not believe that the people here are just 'potential apostates;' in my opinion they have already become apostates, and the writer warns those remaining in the community not to join them by pointing out the judgment that awaits them.

beginning of CD 20:12, whereas the term ‘covenant’ by itself ‘probably refers to the covenant of the group that eventually became Qumran’ (Hultgren 2007:60).

Hultgren (2007:60) continues to argue that this Qumran covenant ‘arose out of the “new covenant in the land of Damascus” and considered itself to be its true heir,’ whereas ‘those who did not join the “covenant” but who followed instead the men of mockery were viewed as traitors’ to both covenants. In other words, while Hultgren is partly in agreement with Davies, he actually proposes a position ‘exactly opposite to that proposed by Davies’ (Hultgren 2007:61). He continues: ‘The “covenant” is the group that arose out of the “new covenant” and that eventually became the Qumran community.’ In support of his position Hultgren (2007:61) notes that in ‘the DSS the term “new covenant” is always used to refer to an entity in the past tense, never in the present tense’ (cf. Lichtenberger 1995:404) and that ‘the Qumran community *never* identifies itself as the “new covenant”’ (Hultgren 2007:61). Thus he suggests that the ‘new covenant’ is the ‘parent movement’ whereas the ‘covenant’ is the title the Qumran community uses to refer to itself (Hultgren 2007:61). This position seems to me the most satisfactory explanation of the enigmatic reference in CD 20:12.

3.2.2.12.4 Concluding Remarks on the Expression ‘New Covenant in the Land of Damascus’

Having looked at all the occurrences of the expression ‘new covenant in the land of Damascus,’ what is in fact ‘new’ about this covenant? And in what way, if any, is it related to Jeremiah’s ‘new covenant’?⁵¹¹ Moreover, considering the other occurrences of the word ‘covenant’ in CD, what did the writer mean when he used that term?

First of all, I accept the opinion that the phrase ‘new covenant in the land of Damascus’ denotes a group or community preceding the writer’s community. The writer of CD considers himself and his community as the successors of this ‘new covenant,’ as the ‘true Israel,’ so to speak. Whenever he speaks about ‘covenant,’ the writer usually has in view either the patriarchal/Sinaitic covenant in general, or he refers specifically to his community’s strict interpretation of that covenant, which the members have promised to keep.

The clearest idea of what the ‘new covenant in the land of Damascus’ actually entailed is found in the context of CD 6:19. There we are told that ‘those who enter the

⁵¹¹ As Nitzan (1995:487) would have it: ‘this [new] covenant [of CD 6:19; 8:21; 20:12] is considered by [the community] to be the fulfilment of Jeremiah’s prophecy (31, 30-33).’

new covenant in the land of Damascus' did so particularly in order to distinguish adequately between pure and defiled, holy and common (CD 6:17-18), and to keep all the special holy days of the Jewish calendar according to their proper interpretation (CD 6:18-19). In other words, at stake were issues of purity and calendar, and in the opinion of the sectarians those not belonging to them were at fault in these matters.

The occurrence in CD 8:21 is more difficult to assess since the next column is obviously missing. In the preceding lines the author has noted that God loved the members of the new covenant community because they set themselves apart from the common people and their customs, but those who did not follow the sect, were judged by God, as happened to Gehazi, Elijah's servant (a negative example) and Baruch, Jeremiah's scribe (a positive example; CD 8:18-21a).⁵¹² According to the translation in DSSEL, this may be a concluding statement (see my reasoning above), but one might also consider these words as the beginning of a new sentence. In this case, neither CD 9:1ff nor CD 15:1ff (which is now commonly placed after CD 8) complete the thought of 8:21.

However, the parallel in CD 19:33-34 may assist here.⁵¹³ If one assumes a similar context for the text following 8:21 (which is possible, but of course only conjecture) the 'new covenant in the land of Damascus' there and elsewhere in CD appears to refer to a sectarian covenant, though obviously based on the Mosaic law according to its strict interpretation by the sectarians. Unlike Jeremiah's new covenant, which is based on a new relationship between God and his people, the newness of the covenant in CD appears to consist more of an *outward* adherence to the rules and regulations of the Mosaic covenant according to the interpretation of the community, which alone is considered correct (cf. Hultgren 2007:112).⁵¹⁴

⁵¹² The lines immediately preceding CD 21 read: 'But as for those who hate him, namely the Builders of the Wall, his anger burns [against them]. *vacat* Like this [is the] judgment is the judgment for all who reject the commandments of God, who forsake them and turn [to follow] the stubbornness of their [own] hearts. *vacat* This is the word which Jeremiah spoke to Baruch, son of Neriah, and Elijah to Gehazi his young servant' (CD 8:18-21a, my translation). After a blank in the line, the following words are found: 'All the men who enter the new covenant in the land of Damascus' (my translation; CD 8:21).

⁵¹³ The words concerning Jeremiah and Baruch and Elijah and Gehazi are missing in CD 19. There the text immediately preceding our phrase reads: 'And G[od] hates and despises the Builders of the Wall, and his ... anger burns against them. And as for all who walk after them, this [is] the judgment for all who reject the commandments of G[od] and forsake them and turn [to follow] the stubbornness of their [own] hearts. Thus [it is for] all the men who enter the new covenant in the land of Damascus, and [who] have turned away and betrayed and turned aside from the well of living waters. They will not be counted/considered (לֹא יִחְשָׁבוּ) in the counsel of the people and in their writings/lists they will not be written from the day of being gathered of the unique Teacher until the rising of the Messiah from Aaron and from Israel' (CD 19:31-20:1; my translation).

⁵¹⁴ In his consideration of CD 16:4-6 Kister points out that though in IQS 5:5 there is an echo of 'the symbolic significance of circumcision' (Baumgarten & Schwartz 1995:41, n. 133, cited by Kister 1999:179; cf. Dt 10:16; Jr 4:4), the sectarians always insisted on the performance of the physical rite (Baumgarten & Schwartz 1995:41, n. 133, cf. Kister 1999:179), and the 'concept of spiritual circumcision is relatively marginal in the Dead Sea Scrolls' (Kister 1999:180).

Hultgren (2007:112) may well be correct in assuming that the ‘new covenant’ idea of CD arose because there was in exile a felt need to ‘seek’ the Lord and ‘find’ him and ‘return’ to him wholeheartedly in order that he might restore the people to their land.⁵¹⁵ Certainly in Jeremiah’s letter (Jr 29:13-14) one of the preconditions for the return of the exiles to their homeland was the wholehearted seeking and resultant finding of the Lord. A few chapters later, God, through Jeremiah, promised a ‘new covenant’ to the people, a covenant that was ‘already part of the covenant law of Moses’ (Hultgren 2007:112-113; cf. Dt 29-30; compare esp. Dt 30:6 with Jr 31:33). In other words, ‘from a postexilic perspective, when God made the covenant with Moses and with Israel, he also made the new covenant of Jeremiah,’ which is therefore ‘subsumed under the covenant of the law of Moses’ (Hultgren 2007:113). Hultgren therefore believes that even though Jeremiah’s new covenant is not mentioned explicitly in CD, the ‘new covenant’ of the sect is nevertheless firmly grounded upon it. There is some truth in this, but I would qualify this statement by noting that CD’s (i.e. the writer’s) conception of what Jeremiah’s ‘new covenant’ entailed is very much based on visible outward performance rather than the inward heart change envisaged by Jeremiah. The terminology is also different in Jeremiah and CD. Although CD mentions God’s forgiveness (e.g. CD 2:4-5; 3:18; the verbs used are כפר, ‘to atone,’ and גשא, ‘to lift, carry away’) a few times, the verb סלה, to forgive, used in Jeremiah 31:34, does not occur in CD (the noun סליחות, lit. forgivenesses, appears once, at CD 2:4). There is no mention of a ‘new heart’ (an expression admittedly not found in Jeremiah either, but which seems to be implied by Jr 31:33) which is what ultimately will enable people to love God in the way he always wished.⁵¹⁶ There is perhaps some implied hint at a ‘new heart’ in CD 16:4-5,⁵¹⁷ but even this text does not come close to Jeremiah’s statement that God himself will intervene on behalf of his people and change them from the inside.

Another difference between Jeremiah’s new covenant and that of CD is that ‘in Jeremiah the new covenant is a promise for the future, while in D the new covenant appears consistently as an entity of the past’ (Hultgren 2007:112). Hultgren explains this difference away by noting that for the community of CD the ‘words of the prophets had already been fulfilled’ and this included ‘Jeremiah’s prophecy of a new covenant’ (Hultgren 2007:112). Nevertheless, the fact that apparently quite a number of the members

⁵¹⁵ The prayer of Daniel 9 seems to support this view.

⁵¹⁶ Though the opposite of the new heart does appear, namely walking ‘in the stubbornness of one’s heart’ (בשרירות לבב; e.g. 2:17; 3:5; 8:19; 19:20). This expression is used almost exclusively in Jeremiah (eight out of ten occurrences; one each appear in Dt 29:18 and Ps 81:13). That the writer of CD is well acquainted with Jeremiah is also evident elsewhere. These stubborn people are contrasted with those who on the other hand choose to ‘hold firm’ (חזק) to God’s commandments (e.g. CD 3:11), an idea that is expressed in a variety of ways. There is, however, no direct command to turn from the stubbornness of one’s heart in CD.

⁵¹⁷ ‘And on the day when a man takes it upon his soul to return to the Torah of Moses Mastemah will turn away from him if he keeps his word’ (my translation; וביום אשר יקום ... האיש על נפשו לשוב אל תורת משה יסור המשטמה מאחריו אם יקים (את דבריו)).

of the sect fell away after a while and left seems to indicate that the ultimate reality of that fulfilment was not yet experienced by them.

It is also interesting that unlike in Jeremiah, the ‘new covenant’ in CD is never contrasted with the ‘old covenant’ (Christiansen 1998:83).⁵¹⁸ It appears, therefore, that the term “‘new covenant’” cannot be understood simply as replacement of an old covenant,’ but the expression is rather ‘used as distinct from a *broken* covenant’ (Christiansen 1998:83). In other words, *new* for the sectarians appears to mean *renewed*. This is obvious from the fact that the sectarians taught ‘the prescriptions of the (“old”) law’ and continually emphasised that it had ‘to be kept according to its correct interpretation’ (Christiansen 1998:83, note 46). The major issues at stake, as noted above, were differences between the sectarians and other Jews regarding purity regulations and the (religious) calendar to be observed (cf. e.g. CD 6:17-20; Christiansen 1998:83). The sect obviously believed in new revelations, but these did not concern literally “‘new’”⁵¹⁹ revelations but radicalized demands, new ways of interpreting the already-existing covenant laws on keeping the Sabbath and other festivals’ (Christiansen 1998:83) as well as other matters important to the sect.

Lastly, though the new covenant is still ‘based on the law of Moses’ (Collins 2010a:24), it did not include all Israelites indiscriminately but only those who had undertaken, with the CD sect, to ‘return to the law of Moses with all [their] heart and soul’ (Collins 2010a:24, cf. CD 15:12). In this the sectarian viewpoint is quite similar to Paul’s in Romans 9-11. Potentially this ‘new’ covenant was for anybody, including proselytes and the children of members, who undertook to do this (Collins 2010a:24), though certain people were excluded on the basis of what seems to be merely external defects such as blindness, lameness and deafness (CD 15:15-17; 4Q266 8i:6-9) or mental instability (‘stupid or deranged,’ CD 15:15; cf. Collins 2010a:24-25). Thus CD’s ‘new covenant ... creates a new community, with its own rites of admission and expulsion’ (Collins 2010a:27). While it is based on the Torah (גללה, the ‘revealed’ things), it nevertheless had its own set of rules and regulations (נסתהר, the ‘things hidden’) that were not to be disclosed to would-be entrants until they had been investigated by the Overseer (מבקר; cf. Collins 2010a:27-28).

⁵¹⁸ At least not in the terms Jeremiah gives (31:31-34), i.e. the fact that the old covenant was never kept, whereas the new covenant would be kept because of God’s enabling.

⁵¹⁹ If ‘new’ is defined as ‘never heard before.’

3.2.3 Concluding Remarks on בְּרִית in CD

The Damascus Document begins, almost like certain sections in the prophets, with a reference to a covenant lawsuit (רִיב) that God has with mankind. It sets the scene for the rest of the document, which exhibits elements of a covenant document. For example, CD begins with a historical introduction (CD 1:1-2:13), and there is a large section containing detailed legislation (CD 9-16) on a variety of issues important to the community it is addressed to. Parts of CD are heavily dependent on Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28 (which contain the covenant blessings and curses; cf. CD 1:17-18) and Deuteronomy 29-30, which outlines the covenant renewal on the brink of Israel's crossing the Jordan.

There are a number of expressions that are either rare, or unique to CD or to the DSS. The first of these is בְּרִית ראשונים, literally the 'first' or 'former covenant' or 'covenant of the first ones,' or 'covenant of the forefathers' (CD 1:4; cf. Lv 26:45). It was suggested that the ראשונים are probably the patriarchs, but the term can also be transferred to the exodus generation, or indeed the predecessors of the writer's community.

The writer refers on several occasions to the members of his community (or that of their predecessors) as באי ברית, 'those who enter[ed] the covenant,' an expression that does not occur in the MT. On one occasion he calls them בעלי ברית, 'owners/partners of the covenant,' which in the context is parallel to 'friends of God' (אֹהֲבִים לֵאל, CD 3:3-4) and perhaps reminiscent of Isaiah 41:8 and 2 Chronicles 20:7. Those who enter the covenant, whether children of members or new entrants, do so by swearing an oath 'by the curses (or 'vows', אֲלוֹת, of the covenant' (CD 15:1-2).

The phrase ברית אל, 'covenant of God,' which appears several times, seems to have been used instead of the expression 'covenant of YHWH' in the MT, since our writer, like most DSS, prefers to avoid the divine name. In CD 3:11 the reference is explicitly to the Sinai covenant, but elsewhere the writer refers to the sectarians' commitment to keep the Mosaic law according to their strict interpretation of it, in particular as regards the 'hidden matters' of the law which the community believed they had uncovered through their exegesis.

Another unique expression is found at CD 10:6: יסודי הברית (lit. 'foundations of the covenant'). The term is yet another way of referring to the sectarians' strict interpretation of the Mosaic law, as is the phrase ברית תשובה, 'covenant of repentance' (or perhaps better, returning, i.e. to the strict adherence of God's law) at CD 19:16.

Only CD among the DSS mentions a 'new covenant in the land of Damascus.' I conclude that the reference to Damascus is more likely figurative than literal and probably

refers to the (Babylonian) exile. The whole expression ‘new covenant in the land of Damascus’ is likely a reference to the predecessors of the writer’s community, whose strict interpretation of the Mosaic law he and his contemporaries have adopted. Moreover, whereas CD 1-16 seems to have been written at a time when apostasy was a threat, but possibly not yet a reality among the members of the writer’s community (or not yet too serious a matter for concern), the situation in CD 19-20 seems to have been somewhat different. There, the writer/editor obviously is concerned about actual defection on a significant scale, and his warnings against apostasy to the remaining members are therefore more pronounced and severe. Thus CD 19-20 appears to belong to a different recension than CD 1-16, adapted to the writer’s/editor’s situation.

The ‘newness’ of the ‘new covenant in the land of Damascus’ appears to refer more to an outward adherence of the law rather than an inward renewal as promised by Jeremiah. Whereas the biblical ‘new covenant’ is considered as future throughout, the ‘new covenant in the land of Damascus’ always refers to something that happened in the past and that is being applied by the writer’s/editor’s community. There is no comparison between the ‘old’ and the ‘new’, as in Jeremiah, but a consistent reference to the importance of keeping the Mosaic law perfectly. What is new is the community’s interpretation and consequent practice of these laws.

3.3 Explanatory Notes on Selected Sections of the Community Rule (1QS) with Special Reference to Covenant Terminology

3.3.1 Introduction – Nature and Organization of the Scroll

The Manual of Discipline or Community Rule (1QS) was, together with 1QM and 1QH, one of the seven scrolls found in 1947 in what is now called Qumran Cave 1.⁵²⁰ It has eleven well preserved columns of text that is often reminiscent of CD. Apart from the Cave 1 copy, ten fragmentary manuscripts were found in Cave 4, and also one in Cave 5 (VanderKam & Flint 2002:217; cf. Schofield 2009:70).⁵²¹ Of these, the most important, since they are the best preserved, are 4QS^b, 4QS^d and 4QS^e. 4QS^{b, d} are almost ‘identical in form and content’ (Schofield 2009:70) and therefore considered to belong to the same textual family. 4QS^b seems to be closest to 1QS since it contains ‘the same sections of the Community Rule as does 1QS’ (Metso 1997:151), though it is much shorter than 1QS. The Cave 4 manuscripts are also younger than 1QS,⁵²² which is usually dated to ca. 100-75 BCE (Schofield 2009:78-79). However, a number of scholars believe the content of the cave 4 manuscripts to be earlier than that of 1QS (e.g. Metso 1997:152; Collins 2010a:53). The scope of the present work does not permit me to go into the details of this argument, but it appears to me that despite the difficulties inherent in this view it is a possible scenario. Since the Cave 4 manuscripts sometimes differ significantly from 1QS, these differences will be highlighted where they are relevant for the discussion of *ברית* below.

The content of 1QS appears to be a somewhat haphazard ‘conglomeration of discrete units’ of text (Schofield 2009:87), but since this is what has been transmitted it must have been put together by its author/redactor in a way that at least to him was considered an ‘integrated whole’ (cf. Schofield 2009:87) and was addressed to a specific audience (perhaps the *משכיל* ‘instructor’ of the community?). The beginning of the scroll is broken, but it appears to begin with directions to the ‘Instructor’ (1QS 1:1, DSSSE; the word is supplied) on what he should teach new entrants about his community (1QS 1:1-15). The next section outlines the ritual to be followed by new members as they are admitted into the community (1QS 1:16-2:18), gives instructions about the ritual for the yearly covenant renewal festival (1QS 2:19-25), and states what is to be done if someone is unwilling to enter into the fellowship: only if he repents of his stubborn ways can he be admitted (1QS 2:25-3:12). 1QS 3:13-4:26 gives instructions regarding the spirits of light

⁵²⁰ Also found in Qumran cave 1 and considered to have originally belonged to 1QS were two other works, 1QS^a (Rule of the Congregation), consisting of two columns, and 1QS^b (Rule of Blessings), consisting of five columns. Due to space restrictions, these two works will not be considered here.

⁵²¹ The Cave 4 and 5 copies do not have S^a or S^b attached.

⁵²² Based on palaeographical data, Schofield (2009:80) dates 4QS^{b, d} (which exhibit similar scripts) to about 30-1 BCE, and 4QS^e to about 50-25 BCE, though there is some debate about this latter date (cf. Schofield 2009:80).

and darkness and their followers (the Sons of Light and the Sons of Belial). A new section begins at 1QS 5:1 which gives regulations about the conduct of meetings, ‘admission of new members’ and punishments for those who break the rules (cf. VanderKam & Flint 2002:217). From 1QS 8:1-10:5 the writer outlines again the nature of his community, and the work closes with a hymn of praise (1QS 10:5-11:22; cf. VanderKam & Flint 2002:217).

In 1QS the term ברית occurs thirty-three times; in 1QS^a it appears four times and in 1QS^b nine times, but for reasons of space I will only consider 1QS. One interesting feature of 1QS is that the word עבר in connection with ברית means ‘enter’ rather than ‘break’ the covenant. At the relevant place this will be commented on in more detail.

3.3.2 The occurrences of ברית in 1QS

3.3.2.1 1QS 1:1-3:12

The first occurrence of ברית in 1QS 1:8 comes in the context of instructions to the unnamed leader (or ‘instructor’, the Maskil משכיל, 1QS 1:1; cf. DSSSE where the word is supplied) of the community whose task it is to ‘bring (להבי; Hiph inf cons בוא + prep ל) all who freely volunteer to perform the statutes of God into the *covenant of mercy*’ (1QS 1:7-8, my translation, but cf. DSSEL; להבי את כול הנדבים לעשוי חוקי אל בברית חסד). This initiatory section outlines the purpose of the Community rule and is apparently concerned with the initiation of new members into the community⁵²³ (Charlesworth & Qimron 1994:7, n. 3). The phrase ברית חסד is significant because this never appears in the HB, and only twice in the DSS, once in the present context, and once in 1QH^a 27:7. What does it mean, and how should it be translated in 1QS 1:8?

In the HB the two words occur together in a few instances elsewhere, but they are usually separated by the conjunction. In all the references the writer shows that God ‘keeps covenant and lovingkindness/mercy’ (Dt 7:9, 1 Ki 8:23, 2 Chr 6:14, Neh 1:5, Neh 9:32, Dn 9:4 - וְשָׁמַר יְהוָה אֶת־הַבְּרִית וְאֶת־הַחֶסֶד; Dt 7:12 - וְשָׁמַר יְהוָה אֶת־הַבְּרִית וְאֶת־הַחֶסֶד). This expression seems to have been coined by the Deuteronomist(s) and is taken up by writers who base their own theology upon them (cf. Zobel 1986:60).⁵²⁴

⁵²³ From 1QS 2:19 it is evident that the ceremony that is described was held yearly for all members of the community, whereas new members were admitted at the same time. Nevertheless, at this stage it seems the writer is emphasising the entrance of new members to the community. The fact that old members also participate is only mentioned as an afterthought, as it were, in 1QS 2:19.

⁵²⁴ Since חסד has been considered above on Daniel 9:4, this discussion need not be repeated here.

The reference to ברית חסד in 1QH^a 27:7 (see also comments on this text below) appears in a rather fragmentary text, with lacunae supplemented by the translator from elsewhere. The words ברית חסדי[ן] ([his] covenant of mercy) are, however, clearly visible (though the 3ms suffix has been supplemented). The context seems to indicate that God lifts up the lowly and does great miracles for them so ‘that they might know the covenant of [His] mercy’ (DSSEL 1QH^a 27:4-8) and as a result acknowledge (and praise) his work for them. This occurrence is not very helpful to establish the meaning of the phrase in 1QS 1:8.

McCready (2011:299) suggests that in 1QS 1:8 the expression ברית חסד should be translated ‘covenant of friendship,’ following a discussion by Brownlee (1951:7 and Appendix B, 48-49) on the meaning of this word in the Manual of Discipline. In view of the fact that חסד is a word that connotes loyalty between parties bound in a relationship (e.g. inter-human relationships or the relationship between God and humans) this might be an acceptable suggestion (cf. Baer & Gordon 1997:211-213). However, as noted above (see on Daniel 9:4), חסד also involves *divine* mercy, grace and forbearance. In the context of 1QS 1, I think that the expression ברית חסד does not merely refer to a covenant between human beings (as the translation ‘covenant of friendship’ seems to imply), but includes especially the covenant of the community with God. This is also expressed by Zimmerli (1974:281), who notes that the main emphasis in ברית חסד is on the divine חסד. Moreover, he continues to outline the specific emphasis of the *yahad* on the special revelation they received from God and which they continued to teach (Zimmerli 1974:282; cf. CD 3:14ff; Dt 29:29; 1QS 8:11f). This gives the expression ברית חסד a nuance that goes beyond the OT use of חסד (Zimmerli 1974:283⁵²⁵). Nevertheless, because of the significance of the divine mercy in the context of 1QS, I would prefer a translation such as ‘covenant of faithfulness’ or ‘covenant of mercy’ for ברית חסד at 1QS 1:8.

From the context in 1QS 1, the covenant referred to is the rules of the congregation which are, of course, based on the Mosaic covenant. The expression ‘covenant of mercy’ (ברית חסד) shows that the writer considered the keeping of the laws according to the strict interpretation of the community not as a burden but rather as a duty, perhaps even joy, a means to please God. The most important aspect of pleasing God according to our writer is the deliberate choice to do whatever God commanded through Moses and the prophets

⁵²⁵ ‘Alle biblizistische Prägung und der gelegentliche Rekurs auf Israel und Mose darf nicht darüber hinwegtäuschen, daß der Ruf zur göttlichen Barmherzigkeit, der in der ברית חסד von Qumran erhoben wird, ein Mehr über das der Gemeinde Israels in ihrer Geschichte und der göttlichen Gesetzgebung durch Mose offenbar Gemachte hinaus zu besitzen beansprucht. ... Die Qumrangemeinde glaubt die Wirkungsmacht des göttlichen חסד in ihrem Vollzug gebunden an das Sonderwissen und die Sondergebote, die diesem “Israel”, das der Sphäre Belials entflohen ist, im Besonderen eigen sind’ (Zimmerli 1974:283).

(1QS 1:3). The phrase ‘and the prophets’ is an important qualifier, as it indicates that not merely the Pentateuch but also other books that we now know as the Old Testament and probably also other texts such as Jubilees and the Enoch literature were included in the teaching of God’s word to the community.

Another important point is made by the writer in 1QS 1:9 where it is indicated that the community’s rules stipulated that members do everything ‘(according to) all that was revealed *for their appointed times that were appointed them*’⁵²⁶ (כול הנגלות למועדי תעודותם) (1QS 1:8-9, my translation). In other words, the writer points out already at the beginning of the document that the correct time⁵²⁷ for performing religious ceremonies is extremely important for the community, and that this is part of what it means to properly keep the covenant (see also evidence elsewhere in the document, e.g. 1QS 1:14-16).

New members must ‘love’ their new companions, the Sons of Light, and ‘hate’ their old ones, the Sons of Darkness (1QS 1:10). This particular instruction is reminiscent of Jesus’ observation that those who do not hate their father, mother, etc. cannot be his disciples. In the same way the community demanded a complete break of the new converts with old ties so that they would be able to live by their strict rules. However, the writer of 1QS also stresses that converts to his community did so out of their own free will (he calls them הנדבִים, e.g. at 1QS 1:11): they were not forced to do so.

A brief comment on this term, הנדבִים, is in order. The root נדב only occurs seventeen times in the HB⁵²⁸ and twenty-four times in the DSS.⁵²⁹ Stauber (2011) has researched this term in some detail. He suggests that ‘any section [in 1QS] that uses נדבִים is talking not about human agency but rather about the realization of divine agency’ (Stauber 2011:352). He further proposes the translation ‘all *those who have been incited/inspired* to do (follow) God’s laws’ for 1QS 1:7 (Stauber 2011:355, italics added), instead of ‘all who volunteer’ (DSSSEL) or ‘all those who freely volunteer’ (DSSSE). Furthermore, Stauber argues that the occurrence of the Hithpael participle (המתנדבִים) in 1QS 5:1 should also be translated ‘the inspired ones’ (i.e. as a reflexive of the Qal, Stauber 2011:355), rather than

⁵²⁶ Charlesworth & Qimron (1994:7) translate ‘all revealed (laws) *at their appointed times*’ (italics added).

⁵²⁷ Charlesworth & Qimron (1994:3) point out that the community followed an adapted solar calendar, rather than the lunar calendar that was observed in Jerusalem.

⁵²⁸ Of these 14 occurrences, 5 appear in 1 Chronicles 29, in connection with people volunteering material to contribute to the eventual building of the temple; similarly the occurrences in Ezra and Nehemiah all concern voluntary gifts or a willingness to do something. With the exception of three occurrences in Exodus, all of the biblical occurrences are in the Hithpael and are translated ‘volunteer’ in the NASB. The three occurrences in Exodus are all in the Qal and are translated ‘stir.’ They all occur in the context of the tabernacle being built, telling of people being *stirred* either by the Spirit or their own heart to contribute to its construction (so also HALOT). Stauber (2011) based his research on this fact and Dimant’s suggestion that the root’s ‘essential meaning ... is revelatory’ (Dimant 1984:538; quoted by Stauber 2011:352).

⁵²⁹ Of these 24 occurrences, 9 are in 1QS, an indication of the significance of this term for the writer of this document. Two of these 9 occurrences in 1QS are Niphal participles, all the others are Hithpael participles.

as ‘those who volunteer.’ He believes that the ‘Treatise of the Two Spirits’ in 1QS proves that the DSS sectarians ‘believed that God determined all, and thus theirs is a metaphysics of fatalism’ (Stauber 2011:356). This is an interesting, even possible, suggestion but I wonder whether here the premise that the sect behind 1QS was deterministic did not in fact inspire the proposition. If the Hithpael is considered the reflexive of the Qal, one would be equally justified in translating ‘stir oneself,’ i.e. ‘volunteer,’ in 1QS 5:1, as in fact the other translations do (cf. Conrad 1998:226).⁵³⁰

The remaining occurrences of ברית in 1QS 1:16, 18, 20 and 24 appear, like the first occurrence in 1QS 1:8, in the context of new members (הבאים,⁵³¹ lit. ‘those who enter’) being initiated into the community. In these lines the word עבר⁵³² is used to describe the act of entering into the covenant. Charlesworth & Qimron (1994:9, n. 19) correctly observe that the terms בוא and עבר ‘represent the strong social barriers constructed by the community.’ It is significant that the expression עבר ברית only occurs in the Community Rule documents and once in 4Q439⁵³³ with the meaning ‘entering the covenant.’⁵³⁴

The question is of course why the author of 1QS should have preferred the term עבר instead of simply בוא for new members/converts ‘entering’ the community. The translators of 1QS in DSSEL in fact render the term ‘initiate’ and ‘those who enter’ ‘initiates.’ If entering the community was considered like a conversion experience, it is actually a very fitting term for ‘crossing/passing over’ from the state of unconversion (if such a term exists) and darkness to one of conversion (see also Evans 2003:63) and thus enlightenment, since the community considered itself as the community of the Sons of Light, whereas outsiders were labelled Sons of Darkness. The biblical clue for the use of the word comes from the only use of עבר in the sense of ‘entering’ a covenant in Deuteronomy 29. In my discussion of this passage (Linington 2002:709) I suggested that

⁵³⁰ Conrad (1998:226) observes that at Qumran the root נב is used in ways similar to the OT, but also that often there is a special nuance indicating ‘the converted of Israel who have left the land of Judah and live strictly according to the law, in other words, those who have freely joined this new community.’

⁵³¹ Charlesworth & Qimron (1994:7, n. 13) rightly observe that בוא in the DSS is a *terminus technicus* for entering the community.

⁵³² Most often עבר in the Qal means to ‘pass by, walk over, cross over’ (Stähli 1997:832-833). In connection with covenant, the word usually means ‘transgress’ (cf. Stähli 1997:834), except in Deuteronomy 29. Stähli (1997:835) rightly notes that in Deuteronomy 29:11 and in 1QS 1:16 etc. ‘[t]he expression *br bibrit yhw* “to enter into the covenant of Yahweh” ... may ... ultimately refer to the rite of passage between the parts of a butchered animal associated with covenant making.’ Cf. also Linington (2002:708ff).

⁵³³ 4Q439 (Lament by a Leader) 1i 2:2.

⁵³⁴ The two words occur in context twenty one times in the DSS. Of these, three occurrences are used in the same way as ברית, namely עברים ברית (1QS 1:20, 24 and 2:10), ‘those who enter/cross over into the covenant.’ Several other similar uses appear in 1QS 1:16, five in 4Q parallels to 1QS, 4Q439 1i, 2:2 (all with the meaning ‘entering the covenant’). The meaning ‘transgress the covenant’ features once in 11Q19 (Temple Scroll), four times in CD and three times in 4Q fragments of CD, as well as two others. Elsewhere in the DSS, and even in 1QS itself, the word עבר is often used in the sense of ‘transgress’ in contexts relating to God’s commandments (e.g. CD 10:3; 1QS 5:7, 14; 8:22; 1QH^a 12:27 etc.), but it may also mean ‘reaching’ a certain age (e.g. CD 15:6) or it is used to express the notion of ‘passing’ (e.g. 1QpHab 4:9; 1QS 2:19-21) or ‘entering’ (i.e. pass over into) a land (e.g. 1QpHab 4:11).

the reason for Deuteronomy to use עבר for ‘entering’ the covenant at this juncture was that a new physical and spiritual boundary was about to be crossed by the Israelites. They were on the brink of completing the wandering through the wilderness and entering the land of Canaan. I suggested that the word עבר involves activity by the people: they had to do something, to make an effort, and I suggest the same reasoning applies here in 1QS. By using this particular terminology the writer points out that something completely new is going to happen to the new member of the community. He is now an ‘initiate,’ an ‘insider’ and therefore the translators of 1QS in DSSSEL are correct to use the word ‘initiate’ in this context. That this part of 1QS is heavily indebted to Deuteronomy becomes even more evident in the following sections.

It is also significant that in 1QS 1:16-17 both בוא and עבר are used: ‘Those who *enter* (הבאים) into the rule of the Community shall *cross over* (יעבורו) into the covenant before God to do everything which he has commanded’ (my translation; וכול הבאים בסרכ, DSSSEL). I believe that this is not merely a stylistic feature of the writer. He makes the theological point just highlighted: ‘those who enter’ do not merely join a community, but they make a complete break with their past life. Perhaps the writer had in mind the crossing of the Jordan,⁵³⁵ which meant an irreversible break with Israel’s past history: after crossing the river (which had been divided by God so that they could cross over, עבר, easily) the river flowed back and became a boundary between the old and new, the wilderness and the promised land, that was not easily crossed again. In the same way the entrance of a new ‘initiate’ into the Community of 1QS meant a complete break with his past life. The initiate had to forsake his past life, vow to obey all the commandments of God as interpreted by the community, and he was warned that backsliding from his new position would have the gravest possible consequences. The following paragraphs outline the duties of the new member and the proper admission procedure to be followed.

Entering the community meant a commitment to the strict adherence to the Law of Moses (ככול אשר צוה), ‘according to all that he commanded;’ 1QS 1:17) as interpreted by the community and is referred to here as the ‘covenant *before* God’ (בברית ... לפני אל; 1QS 1:16). Moreover, the new members must not ‘turn back’ (שוב) from their resolve because of fear (פחד ואימה), presumably of persecution, or because of testing (ומצרף) ‘during the dominion of Belial’ (1QS 1:18, DSSSE). Apparently there was a real danger that new converts would fall away from their new-found faith (if one may call it thus) due to open

⁵³⁵ See Evans (2003:63) who makes a similar point, noting that ‘the language of “entering” (בוא) and ‘crossing over’ (עבר) is reminiscent of the tradition of Israel crossing the Jordan River and entering the Promised Land’ (cf. Dt 9:1, which he proceeds to quote).

persecution from outsiders or perhaps even simply because the austere lifestyle of the community was too taxing. The term for ‘testing,’ צרף, in this context is noteworthy.⁵³⁶ In Daniel 11:35, the word occurs in connection with the persecution that those who have understanding (המשכילים) will endure at the time of the end, when some of them will fall which will be for the refining (צרף) and purging of the rest. Daniel 12:10 makes it clear that such purging, purifying and refining (צרף) will only be happening to the many (רבים) who remain faithful, whereas others will fall away. The connotation of the word therefore seems to be refinement by the most extreme means (fire in the crucible for metal, hard circumstances and persecution for people) in order to get the purest possible end-product. In the context of 1QS 1:16, the testing envisaged is apparently that of opposition against members of the group.

Next the writer outlines the procedure or liturgy to be followed when new members are initiated into the community (1QS 1:18b-2:18). This long section begins with a blessing by the priests and Levites who are present (1QS 1:18b-19), which the new entrants (העוברים בברית) are to confirm by saying ‘Amen, Amen’ (1QS 1:20) as they enter the covenant (ובעוברים בברית, 1:18). Next the priests have to recite God’s wonderful acts on behalf of Israel, whereas the Levites have to confess their sins ‘during the dominion of Belial’ (1QS 1:21-24). This confession is to be emulated by the new entrants (ובעוברים בברית, 1:24), who are given the precise words they are to use in their confession (1QS 1:24-2:1). Some of these words are reminiscent of Daniel’s prayer of confession in chapter 9, though only *הט[אנו]* and *הרשענו* appear here in 1QS. Daniel is far more precise and extensive than this prayer, which simply confesses transgression, sin and evil, but like Daniel the new entrants identify with their forebears in their prayer of confession by noting how they and their fathers before them had sinned against God and thus incurred his judgment (1QS 1:25-26).⁵³⁷

More to the point, three of the words of Solomon’s prayer at the temple dedication (1 Ki 8, esp. verses 46-52; 2 Chr 6, esp. verses 36-39) are used in the present context. Solomon envisages a time when Israel is in exile because of her sin, but then comes to her senses, repents and prays to God from the foreign land where they are exiled, saying, ‘We have sinned, we have committed iniquity, we have acted wickedly’ (הֲטָאֲנוּ הַעֲוִינוּ וְרָשָׁעֵנוּ) 1

⁵³⁶ In the HB, צרף occurs thirty-three times and is used for the refining process of metal (especially gold and silver) by a smith (who incidentally is called צורף, e.g. Is 40:19) or of people by God, for God’s testing (i.e. limiting, sorting out by exclusion) Gideon’s forces (Jdg 7:4), and for the purity (i.e. refined nature) of God’s word (Ps 119:140).

⁵³⁷ Nehemiah also prays a prayer of repentance on behalf of the people and identifies with them (Neh 1:6-7), using the word *הטאנו*.

Ki 8:46, 2 Chr 6:37).⁵³⁸ The next verse then notes that if the people thus ‘return to You with all their heart and with all their soul’ (2 Chr 6:38, NASB, וְשָׁבוּ אֵלֶיךָ בְּכָל-לֵבָבָם וּבְכָל-נַפְשָׁם, cf. 1 Ki 8:48) and pray to God, that God may listen to their prayers, forgive them and ‘maintain their cause’ (2 Chr 6:39, NASB; cf. 1 Ki 8:49-50). The writer of 1QS has changed the words and word order of 2 Chronicles 6:37 slightly⁵³⁹ and added ‘we have transgressed’ (נַעֲוִינוּ [פ]שַׁעֲנוּ [חט]אָנוּ הרשענו), but one cannot help but wonder whether this episode was in his mind when he penned these lines. If this is so, he obviously intended this ceremony in his community to convey such a return to God as Solomon envisaged, with the hope that God would turn in favour towards this repentant remnant. The repeated emphasis in 1QS on returning to God ‘with all their heart and with all their soul’ supports this supposition.

The prayer then quickly turns to God’s mercy upon them (1QS 2:1) and the priests follow this prayer by the entrants by blessing the whole community (1QS 2:2-4) with a blessing similar to that of Numbers 6:24-26 (cf. Nitzan 2000:97), but not using God’s personal name and adding certain items that do not occur in the Numbers passage (cf. Zimmerli 1974:278-279). The ceremony also includes a section of curses by the Levites on all outsiders, the ‘men of the lot of Belial’ (1QS 2:4-9), which is to be confirmed by those who enter the covenant (ובעוברים בברית, 2:10) with ‘Amen, Amen.’ This reciting of blessings and curses is reminiscent of the covenant ceremony in Deuteronomy 27-28, especially the ceremony on Mt Ebal (cf. Stallman 1995:182; Schiffman 2004:274, 2010:251), though this chapter is not quoted.⁵⁴⁰ However, 1QS adds an eschatological dimension to the ‘themes of protection, illumination, and peace’ that is not present in the original the Aaronic blessing (בדעת עולמים ... לשלום עולמים, 1QS 2:3, 4; Anderson 2011:51). Furthermore, ‘[t]he threefold theme of no mercy, no forgiveness, no peace’ in the curses ‘is reminiscent of the prologue and epistles of Enoch and is directed against outsiders’ (Anderson 2011:51), and the curse too is ‘viewed eschatologically, ארורי עולמים (1QS II:17)’ (Anderson 2011:52). Anderson, significantly, observes that one of the purposes of this recitation of the blessings and curses has to do with the demarcation of ‘socio-religious boundaries’, a fact that is advanced by the use of the word עבר in the context, which clearly indicates ‘boundary language’ (Anderson 2011:52).⁵⁴¹ He does, however, see no connection to Deuteronomy 29 (see below). The citation of blessings and curses

⁵³⁸ Schiffman (2004:274; 2010:251) notes that the confession of the people here is ‘similar to that which became the norm in later Jewish penitential ritual.’

⁵³⁹ נַעֲוִינוּ is Niphal pf 1cp of עוה, whereas הֶעֱוִינוּ is Hiphil pf 1cs; הרשענו is Hiphil pf 1cs whereas וְרָשַׁעְנוּ is Qal. The word order in BHS is הֶעֱוִינוּ וְרָשַׁעְנוּ, whereas in 1QS 1:25-26 it is הרשענו [חט]אָנוּ [פ]שַׁעֲנוּ.

⁵⁴⁰ Falk (2011:275) notes that though there is confession of sin, there is no plea for forgiveness here.

⁵⁴¹ Anderson (2011:53) continues to observe that the curses on outsiders functioned ‘as a back-handed blessing to the Ingroup which uttered the curse and as a force to deny others participation in that community.’

enhanced (if total annihilation can be enhanced) by the fact that God will ‘separate him for evil’ or disaster (ויבדילהו אל לרע, 1QS 2:16; cf. Dt 29:20, והבדילו יהוה לרעה). The wording here is almost the same as in Deuteronomy 29:20, except that the writer has used the title אל for God instead of the personal name יהוה and רע instead of the synonymous רעה. After the pronouncement of the curses the entrants into the covenant (באי הברית) again have to confirm their assent with a double ‘Amen’ (1QS 2:18). This concludes the instructions regarding the entrance ceremony.

The next line, however, makes it clear that this entrance ceremony did not only apply when new members were admitted to the congregation, but it was apparently a yearly ceremony in which all members, both old and new, took part (1QS 2:19). The order of initiation is also regulated (1QS 2:20-22): priests first, Levites second, all others last according to their rank⁵⁴⁷ in the community. After describing the constitution of the true *Yahad* as a community of people who walk in truth, faithfulness and humility and who genuinely care for one another, the writer once again denounces those who refuse to enter this covenant (1QS 2:26, with ברית restored) but prefer to walk in the stubbornness of their own heart (1QS 2:25-3:1). The way the section is phrased indicates an apostate (or, perhaps better, backslider⁵⁴⁸) whose person and property once was considered part of the community, but is now no longer to be used lest the community become defiled (1QS 3:1ff). As long as such a person refuses the discipline of the *Yahad*, there is no chance for him to please God, but once he accepts it and submits to it, there is hope for him, because the only way to receive atonement for sin is through the *Yahad* and its discipline (1QS 3:6-8). A person who submits to this discipline can turn away from his past ways and ‘order his steps to walk blamelessly in all God’s ways’ (1QS 3:9-10, my translation, but cf. DSSEL) and resolve not to turn aside from any of its detail again. If he does, his ‘atoning [sacrifices] of soothing odour’ are accepted by God and he will be allowed to be part of ‘the eternal covenant of the *Yahad*’ (lit. ‘it⁵⁴⁹ will be for him as a covenant of the *Yahad* of eternities,’ והיתה לו לברית יחד עולמים, 1QS 3:11⁵⁵⁰). This expression is interesting because it seems to indicate that the writer of 1QS considered the *Yahad* itself to be the only true covenant between Israel and God (cf. also Schiffman 1989:12, commenting on 1QS^a 1:1-5). This concludes this section of 1QS, as the *vacat* at the end of line 12 and the beginning of line 13 indicates.

⁵⁴⁷ Which is considered pre-ordained; 1QS 2:23.

⁵⁴⁸ Unlike an apostate, a backslider can still be restored to the community when he repents (cf. 1QS 3:5-10). A true apostate will not find such repentance in himself, and therefore is forever lost.

⁵⁴⁹ I.e. apparently the sacrifice of atonement, though interestingly enough the verb והיתה is a Qal pf 3fs with waw-conjunction, but all preceding nouns are masculine.

⁵⁵⁰ Charlesworth & Qimron (1994:15) translate ‘Then he will be accepted by an agreeable atonement before God, and it shall be unto him a covenant of the everlasting Community’ (1QS 3:11-12).

3.3.2.2 1QS 3:13-4:26

Charlesworth & Qimron (1994:15, n. 56) note that 1QS 3:13-4:26 is a 'self-contained section' that could possibly have been written by the Teacher of Righteousness himself, but suggest that it is more probable that this section merely 'contains his teachings.' In this part of the book the word ברית only occurs once, at 1QS 4:22. The whole section sets out the deterministic faith of the community ('Nothing can be changed,' ואין להשנות, Charlesworth & Qimron 1994:15, 1QS 3:16) concerning God's creation, in particular his creation of humankind. Here we find the teaching concerning the two spirits that influence humans on earth, namely darkness and light, each represented by an angel who can inspire humans either to sin (the Angel of Darkness) or to good deeds (the Angel of Light). Those chosen by God are the Sons of Light, but even they can be tripped up by the Angel of Darkness to walk in sin. However, God through the Angel of Light helps the Sons of Light (1QS 3:24-25) in whom he delights (4:1) and whom he guides into true righteousness (4:2). In short, anything good in humans comes through the influence of the Angel of Light, and those who please God are able to walk in his ways, and the ultimate result will be eternal bliss (1QS 4:3-8). On the other hand, everything evil, including the temptations and trials of the Sons of Light (who are also called Sons of Truth here, 1QS 4:6), comes through the influence of the Angel of Darkness upon mankind, and those who do not get out of his grip will face 'everlasting terror and shame'⁵⁵¹ and ultimate 'annihilation in the fire of the dark region' (1QS 4:9-14; the quotations are from Charlesworth & Qimron 1994:17, 1QS 4:13 and 14).

All throughout this present age, according to the writer of 1QS, these two spirits struggle and influence humankind until at last God will judge the world (1QS 4:20) and put an end to all wickedness and 'destroy it forever' (1QS 4:19, Charlesworth & Qimron 1994:19). At that time mankind will experience a purging by the Holy Spirit (also called 'Spirit of Truth', רוח אמת), with the result that all 'ungodly acts' will be removed (1QS 4:21, Charlesworth & Qimron 1994:19), and the purged human being will 'have insight into the knowledge of the Most High and the wisdom of the sons of heaven, and the perfect in the Way may receive understanding' (1QS 4:22, Charlesworth & Qimron 1994:19). The Hebrew of 1QS 4:22 reads: להבין ישרים בדעת עליון והכמת בני שמים להשכיל תמימי ('to cause the upright to understand the knowledge of the Most High and the wisdom of the sons of heaven,⁵⁵² to cause the perfect of the way to

⁵⁵¹ The translation is reminiscent of Daniel 12:2 (disgrace and everlasting contempt, NASB; לתקרות לדראון עולם), but the Hebrew only has one word in common (חרפה, 'disgrace, reproach'), and adds a number of different concepts: לועות; נצה וחרפת עד עמ כלמת כלה באש מחשכים; 'for everlasting terror and reproach forever, with the disgrace of complete destruction in the fire of the dark places' (1QS 4:12-13, my translation).

⁵⁵² DSSEL translates 'angels.'

understand, for God has chosen them for an everlasting covenant;’ my translation). The wording here is interesting as it is reminiscent of some of the terminology used in Daniel 9 and 11-12. For example, 1QS 4:19 speaks of a ‘time of *decreed* judgment’ (קִץ מִשְׁפֵּט נִחְרָצָה); Daniel 9:27 announces ‘complete annihilation that is *decreed*’ (כְּלָה וְנִחְרָצָה), also in the context of judgment.⁵⁵³

The idea of insight for the upright is a theme that is prominent in Daniel 11:29-35. There it is stated that ‘those who have insight [among] the people will give understanding to many’ (וּמְשַׁכְּלֵי עַם יְבִינּוּ לְרַבִּים) in a time of previously unknown hardship and persecution. The words בִּין, רַבִּים and מְשַׁכְּלֵי are particularly noteworthy as reminiscent of the terminology used in 1QS, though of course the context in Daniel 11 is quite different. Another interesting word in 1QS 4:22 is the title עֲלִיּוֹן, ‘Most High,’ for God. This title for God appears for the first time in Genesis 14⁵⁵⁴ where Abraham meets Melchizedek, and again in Numbers 24:16 in Balaam’s fourth oracle of blessing for Israel. Most important for the present context, it appears also in Deuteronomy 32:8 in Moses’ blessing of Israel. It has already been noted that 1QS is heavily indebted to this book.⁵⁵⁵

The expression לְבְרִית עוֹלָמִים in 1QS 4:22, the only occurrence of בְּרִית in this section, is also interesting because it is unique. Neither in the DSS nor in the HB does this exact phrase occur again, though both the DSS and the HB use the phrase ‘eternal covenant’ (בְּרִית עוֹלָם). This designation is actually quite frequent in the MT and occurs with all the major covenants: the Noahic covenant (Gn 9:16); the Abrahamic covenant (Gn 17:7); the Sabbath covenant (Ex 31:16, Lv 24:8); the covenant of everlasting priesthood with Phinehas (Nu 25:13); the Sinai covenant (at Jdg 2:1); the Davidic covenant (2 Sm 23:5; Is 55:3); the covenant with restored Israel (Is 61:8; Jr 50:5; Ezk 16:60); the new covenant of Jeremiah (Jr 32:40). By using the plural form⁵⁵⁶ לְבְרִית עוֹלָמִים, the writer of 1QS obviously wanted to make it abundantly clear to his readers that the covenant he was talking about was in line with these biblical covenants, and yet went beyond them in that it applied to his own generation in a special way. What is meant by the next clause, ‘and all

⁵⁵³ Cf. Isaiah 10:23 and 28:22. See the discussion of the root at Daniel 9:26. In the DSS the exact form נִחְרָצָה appears altogether five times. One of these occurrences is the same expression as in Daniel and Isaiah, כְּלָה וְנִחְרָצָה, in 1QH^a 11:36. The expression קִץ נִחְרָצָה, ‘decreed/appointed time (or end),’ appears in 1QS 4:25, and the phrase מִשְׁפֵּט נִחְרָצָה of the present context also appears in 4Q369 (Prayer of Enosh), which is a rather fragmentary text. It seems that the word is mainly used in contexts where God’s judgment is predicted.

⁵⁵⁴ 4 times. The word occurs 35 times with the meaning ‘Most High’ or ‘Highest One’ as a title for God. The other 23 occurrences in the HB are adjectives meaning ‘high’ or ‘upper,’ depending on the context.

⁵⁵⁵ Twenty-one out of twenty-two occurrences of עֲלִיּוֹן in the Psalms refer to God, as do the four occurrences in Daniel 7. Not surprisingly, the Genesis Apocryphon uses the title El Elyon nine times for God, but what is noteworthy is that 1QH^a only uses it twice, at 12:31 and 14:33.

⁵⁵⁶ Brin (2001:278) plausibly suggests that the plural עוֹלָמִים came into existence as a result of overuse of the term עוֹלָם, and as a result of the feeling of the authors that there was need for a specific expression to express distance in time ... [especially] the element of eternity....’

the glory of Adam shall be theirs' (1QS 4:23, DSSEL) is not quite clear. Perhaps the writer refers to the pre-fall situation in Genesis 1-2, when Adam and Eve had an unbroken relationship with God (so also Fletcher-Louis 2002:96-97, esp. 97).⁵⁵⁷ The next clause seems to support this, since the writer notes that 'there shall be no more evil' (ואין עולה יהיה), my translation) and 'all deeds of deceit' will be put to shame (1QS 4:23, DSSEL).⁵⁵⁸ The section ends by stating again that the two spirits already mentioned are continuing to influence humankind in the present, and that each person, depending on the preordained inclination within, will follow either the evil one or the good one, until the day of judgment ordained by God arrives (1QS 4:23-26).

3.3.2.3 1QS 5:1-6:22

Column 5 begins with another list of rules for the 'men of the congregation who freely offer to turn back from all wickedness' (וזה הסרכ לאנשי היחז המתנדבים לשוב מכול רע; 1QS 5:1, DSSEL, my translation, but cf. DSSEL). The distinguishing mark of the community is that it keeps itself completely separate from everyone they perceive to be less committed than themselves to fulfilling God's law as they interpret it. The community is to be united in 'law and wealth, and repenting according to the instruction (lit. 'mouth') of the sons of Zadok, the priests, the keepers of the covenant and according to the instruction (lit. 'mouth') of the multitude of the men of the *Yahad* who hold fast to the covenant' (my translation; 1QS 5:2-3: ומשובים על פי בני צדוק הכוהנים שומרי הברית 'על פי רוב אנשי היחז המחזקים (בברית).⁵⁵⁹

The expression that is of interest here is בני צדוק הכוהנים שומרי הברית, 'the sons of Zadok, the priests, the keepers (or guardians) of the covenant.' This exact expression only occurs here and in 1QS 5:9 in the DSS and never in the HB. The expression שומר הברית

⁵⁵⁷ Fletcher-Louis (2002:97) writes that 'the notion of Adam's glory is best understood as an affirmation of a particular theological anthropology, rooted, not in the *Endzeit*, but the *Urzeit*: because the true Israel are the true Adam and the Qumran community are the true Israel they possess all that Adam possessed before his departure from paradise.'

⁵⁵⁸ Charlesworth & Qimron (1994:19) translate 1QS 4:23: 'and all the glory of Adam shall be theirs without deceit. All false works will be put to shame.'

⁵⁵⁹ Nitzan (2010b) argues that 1QS 5:1-7a lists a catalogue of ten principles, a number derived possibly, but not necessarily, in imitation of the Decalogue's Ten Commandments, that outline the duties of each member of the community as individuals to God as well as to one another and the community as a whole. These rules are then elaborated and specified in the following text (1QS 5:7b-9:11; Nitzan 2010b:57-58) where practical application of the principles is enunciated. The present text, 1QS 5:1-2a, represents the 'Obligations of Each Member of the Community as an Individual' which include three obligations: 'Repentance,' 'Performance of the Lord's commandments,' and 'Separation' (Nitzan 2010b:59). 1QS 5:2b-5a lists the 'Obligations Regarding Relationships within the Community', which include 'Partnership,' 'Discipline' by the priests, 'Friendship and honesty' and 'Refraining from going astray' (Nitzan 2010b:59). 'The Goals of the Community as a Whole' are outlined in 1QS 5:5b-7a and include the 'Establishment of [an] eternal foundation,' 'Atonement' and the 'Condemnation of the transgressors' (Nitzan 2010b:60).

appears six times in the HB⁵⁶⁰ and three times in the DSS⁵⁶¹ as an attribute of God, describing his faithfulness to his word, usually as שומר הברית ו[ה]חסד. That a similar epithet should be used for the priests of the *Yahad* is significant, as it indicates the importance the community set on the accurate observance of the Mosaic covenant regulations according to their own interpretation and as safeguarded by the spiritual leaders of the community.

The priests, i.e. the guardians of the covenant, were to supervise all gatherings of the community (1QS 5:1-2) but these were nevertheless conducted under the ‘majority rule of the men of the *Yahad* who hold fast to the covenant’ (1QS 5:2-3; ומשובים על פי בני צדוק). The decisions of the community were ‘made by lot’ regarding matters of ‘law, property and judgment’ (1QS 5:3-4; DSSSE). The ‘majority rule of the men of the *Yahad* who hold fast to the covenant’ appear to be fully accepted members of the community, who, in perhaps almost democratic style,⁵⁶² made decisions together under the chairmanship of the priests. The covenant in the expression ‘hold fast to the covenant’ is the covenant of the community to keep the Mosaic law strictly according to their interpretation of it.

Charlesworth & Qimron (1994:19, n. 84) observe that the ‘intended meaning [of the expression ‘the priests who keep the covenant,’ 1QS 5:2] is that the Sons of Zadok are the only priests who are faithful to God and his rules.’ They note further that the expression שומר הברית ו[ה]חסד does not appear in the parallel 4Q258 (1QS^d) 1:1-2 and probably also not in 4Q256 (4QS^b) 9:1-3 (the manuscript is fragmentary and the reconstructed lines in DSSSEL do not have the expression). They suggest that this could be either a matter of haplography in those two manuscripts, or an insertion in 1QS. In the latter case, this would be ‘impressive evidence that the status of the Sons of Zadok increased as the Community evolved’ (Charlesworth & Qimron 1994:19, n. 84).

Schofield on the other hand observes that the text in 1QS 5:2-3 and the variants noted make sense without assuming scribal errors. She suggests that the differences in the manuscripts ‘were deliberate creations;’ in other words, ‘there was an “undoubtedly theological” motive for the scribe(s) to have made these changes’ (Schofield 2009:96,

⁵⁶⁰ Deuteronomy 7:9; 1 Kings 8:23; 2 Chronicles 6:14; Nehemiah 1:5; 9:32; Daniel 9:4 (see the section on the phrase above).

⁵⁶¹ CD 19:1, citing Deuteronomy 7:9 (שומר הברית והחסד); 4Q393 (4Q Communal Confession) 1ii, 2:11 (שומר [ה]ברית) and slightly adapted in 1QM 14:8 (השומר ברית) in the expression ‘the one who kept the covenant of our forefathers’ (DSSSEL).

⁵⁶² Schiffman (2003:418) is right to note that the *Yahad* was not a ‘truly democratic institution because it did not grant rights beyond a small circle.’ As only full members were allowed in the decision making process and women were completely excluded (Schiffman 2003:418), this is correct. Nevertheless, the system was not completely autocratic either, as these lines prove, though there were strict regulations concerning the order of speakers. Schiffman (2003:423) in fact notes that throughout the history of the sect, ‘democratization’ and ‘laicization’ continued to increase.

quoting Metso 1997:78). Furthermore, rather than argue that one text form was changed from another or later scribes inserted the text in 1QS, Schofield (2009:97-98) proposes, more plausibly in my opinion, that the different manuscripts reflect different traditions within the community and that a ‘bi-partite leadership structure,’ in which both the Many and the Zadokite Priests had significant roles to play, is perfectly possible as it has ‘strong precedent in the ancient Near East.’ This would explain the occurrence of both the Zadokite priests and the ‘multitude’ (or ‘the Many’ in the parallel texts) in the same context.

This ‘multitude’⁵⁶³ (or perhaps with DSSEL ‘majority rule’ of the men of the *Yahad*, רוב אנשי היהוד, the proven members of the community, are given the title ‘who hold fast to (or perhaps better ‘persevere steadfastly in,’ DSSSE) the covenant’ (1QS 5:3; המהזקים בברית). A similar expression is used in Isaiah 56:4 and 6 where God promises those who normally were considered outside the covenant, namely eunuchs and foreigners, that he would accept them if they ‘hold fast to my covenant’ (וּמְהַזְקִים בְּבְרִיתִי). It is interesting that in the context of Isaiah the particular aspect of holding fast to the covenant was the keeping of the Sabbath by not profaning it which is an important issue for the *Yahad* as well. One might even argue that the author of 1QS at this point particularly emphasised the matter of the correct calendar.

The question is, of course, whether the community took this allusion to Isaiah 56 so far as to allow foreigners, i.e. non-Jews and eunuchs into its community. Commenting on the question of who was allowed to enter the CD community, Davies (1995:138) suggests that ‘it is possible to argue that non-Jews were admitted into the sect.’ He points to the instruction in CD 11:2, which states that ‘no-one may send a *ben ha-nekar*⁵⁶⁴ to do something for him on the sabbath day’ (Davies 1995:138, his translation) and points out that it is unlikely that the *ben ha-nekar* is a foreigner, since the fact that a member of the sect would ask a non-Jew to do something for him was improbable.⁵⁶⁵ Then he links this

⁵⁶³ 1QS^b and 1QS^d both read ‘the Many’ (הרבים; cf. Charlesworth & Qimron 1994:21, n. 85) instead of 1QS’s רוב, ‘multitude’ (DSSSE) or ‘majority’ (DSSEL). Huppenbauer (1957:136) argues that רוב indicates members of the community apart from the priests, whereas רבים is used for all members including the priests who are allowed to take part in the decision making process. In view of the fact that 4Q258 (4QS^d) I (1ai, 1b):2 simply has רבים where 1QS includes a whole sentence, this is an acceptable conclusion.

⁵⁶⁴ Rabin (1958:54) translates the term בן הנכר in CD 11:2 ‘proselyte (or: gentile).’ Like Davies (1995:139) he observes the connection to Isaiah 56:6, which, Rabin says, contains the term ‘*nilwim*, the techn. term for the sect’s neophytes’ (Rabin 1958:54).

⁵⁶⁵ I am not so sure that such an argument would hold. In her autobiography, Lydia Prince (1975:140), a Christian (of gentile descent) who went to live in Jerusalem, is asked by a neighbour to light for her a lamp after the beginning of the Sabbath because she had failed to do so herself and was by Jewish law forbidden to do so; hence I do not find this law strange or unlikely at all. If a Jew can ask a gentile to do something he/she is not permitted to do him/herself in the 1920’s or 1930’s CE, it may well have happened in the second or first century BCE too. Therefore the phrase בן הנכר may well refer to a foreigner.

text with Isaiah 56 where the בני הנכר are welcome to approach Yahweh.⁵⁶⁶ Davies (1995:139) comments that in CD 11:2 the term was ‘deliberately chosen in preference to the more usual גר ... to make the allusion to the Isaiah texts⁵⁶⁷ clear.’ He further argues that while this evidence does not necessarily mean that the CD sect included non-Jews among its members, ‘at least the author of CD identifies a prophetic passage which would allow it to do so’ (Davies 1995:139-40). In addition, the participle מהזיקים that appears in Isaiah 56 also appears four times in CD⁵⁶⁸ to describe those who hold fast to God’s commandments. While the term נכר does not appear in 1QS, DSSSEL translates the expression הגלויים עליהם in 1QS 5:6 ‘Gentile proselytes who join them’ (DSSSE has simply ‘those who join them;’ so also Charlesworth & Qimron 1994:21). If this interpretation is correct, and I believe it is, it would indicate that non-Jews were welcome in the *Yahad* as long as they committed themselves to the same stringent observance of the law as Jewish community members.

Equally interesting is whether eunuchs (and in Isaiah the term סריס must be interpreted as meaning a person with a physical defect⁵⁶⁹) would have been acceptable. Davies (1995:140) does not explicitly comment on the question, but relates it to the issue of celibacy. Such regulations as the prohibition of sexual relations for pleasure (4Q270 (4QD^e) 7i:10) and in the holy city indicate that the sectarians viewed sexual intercourse as necessary only to propagate the human race, but otherwise considered it as ‘unholy’ (Davies 1995:141). Davies (1995:141) argues that since the Damascus sect at least theoretically derived its principles from scripture, it is possible that the allusion to Isaiah 56 which ‘links eunuchs with keeping the sabbath and the covenant, the two primary obligations of the sect,’ ... provided ‘a link between membership of the sect and celibacy.’ However, since 1QS^a 2:5-6 explicitly prohibits people with a physical defect (specifically identified as those who are crippled, lame, blind, deaf, dumb or having a visible blemish, DSSSEL) to enter the congregation, it seems likely that by definition a eunuch would be excluded from joining the community in 1QS too, no matter what his spiritual intentions were (cf. Schiffman 1989:43, 48).

The Zadokite priests and the ‘multitude of the men of the *Yahad*’ are to decide together ‘matters of law, wealth and judgment’ in the community (1QS 5:3). Together their

⁵⁶⁶ In an interesting aside he observes that 1QIs^a varies significantly from MT, since it reads ובני הנכר הגלויים אל להיות לו. ובני הנכר הגלויים אל להיות לו. instead of MT’s more provocative והזיקים עליהם לשרתו ולאמרה את השם יהוה, which seems to allow the foreigner (or proselyte) to do ministry at the temple, thus possibly implying that he can be a member of the priesthood (see Davies 1995:139).

⁵⁶⁷ He indicates that נכר also appears in Isaiah 61:6 and 60:10, the latter possibly with a positive sense like that in Isaiah 56.

⁵⁶⁸ Though not in the exact expression that appears in Isaiah.

⁵⁶⁹ Isaiah 53:3 says that the סריס complains that he is a ‘dry tree,’ and in verse 5 the reward he is promised is said to be better than children. Incidentally, the word סריס never occurs in 1QS or CD, and in all the DSS only twice, each time meaning ‘official.’

life is characterised by the biblical virtues of humility, justice, righteousness, and loving covenant faithfulness (lit. אהבת חסד, 1QS 5:3-4). This way all waywardness will be avoided, and the members of the community can work together to rid each other from their evil inclinations (1QS 5:4-5). Moreover, they all together can ‘circumcise the foreskin’ of their ‘inclination, namely the stiff neck, to lay a foundation of truth for Israel, namely the community (or *Yahad*) of the eternal covenant, to atone for all those who freely offer themselves to holiness in Aaron’ (1QS 5:5-6; my translation, but cf. DSSEL). Here there is another significant phrase: ‘the community of the eternal covenant’ (יהד ברית עולם).⁵⁷⁰ In the present context, the reference is to the covenant of the writer’s own community, who committed themselves to obey the Mosaic covenant according to their own strict interpretation.⁵⁷¹ The purpose of the community, as stated, is to make atonement, a concept that together with that of the ‘eternal covenant’ is very important ‘in the vocational understanding of the sect’s members, particularly in passages found only in 1QS’ (Schofield 2009:98, n. 93).

What this entailed is explained further in 1QS 5:6. The community’s purpose is ‘to atone for’ three groups of people, namely (1) ‘all those who freely offer themselves to holiness in Aaron’ and (2) ‘for the house of truth [or faithfulness] in Israel’ and (3) ‘for those who would join them for community’ (לכפר לכול המתנדבים לקודש באהרון ולבית האמת) (בישראל והגלויים עליהם ליהד who would join them for community’ are in fact non-Jews was discussed above.⁵⁷² It seems from the context that the atonement envisaged had to do with getting rid of anybody who was not fully committed to keeping the law according to the community’s interpretation, since through ‘a lawsuit and judgment’ anybody found guilty of transgressing a single law must be ‘condemned’ (1QS 5:7, DSSEL) or ‘pronounced guilty’ (Charlesworth & Qimron 1994:21; וּלְרִיב וּלְמִשְׁפֵּט לְהִרְשִׁיעַ כּוֹל עוֹבְרֵי חוֹק). The exact procedure of these judgments is outlined in the following section.

In 1QS 5:7ff we find another set of instructions regarding the ritual to be observed at the entrance ceremony (or covenant renewal ceremony, cf. Schofield 2009:90). The section starts with a unique clause not found in 4QS^b and 4QS^d: ‘These are the arrangements of their ways concerning all these statutes when they gather as a community’

⁵⁷⁰ Cf. the comments above on the expression ברית עולמים at 1QS 4:22.

⁵⁷¹ Charlesworth & Qimron (1994:21, n. 93) and Schofield (2009:98) point out that the words ברית עולם לכפר do not appear in 4QS^b and 4QS^d. Schofield (2009:98) observes that it is unlikely that the words were intentionally omitted. Rather, it is either a case of homoioteleuton or, more likely, the words were added in 1QS to express the ideas of covenant and atonement more strongly (Schofield 2009:98).

⁵⁷² Schofield (2009:89-90) also thinks that these are proselytes who enter the covenant ‘in the sight of the *Mitnadvim*’ (Schofield 2009:90). She considers lines 7-8 as an ‘indirect reference to the covenant renewal ceremony described only in 1QS.’

(my translation; ואלה תכון דרכיהם על כול החוקים האלה בהאספם ליחד; see Metso 2006:287). Metso (2006:288) rightly observes that this additional clause in 1QS ‘makes it clear that joining the community meant entering the covenant.’ Also absent in 4QS^b and 4QS^d are the words יבוא בברית אל לעיני כול המתנדבים (‘they shall enter into the covenant of God in full view of all volunteers;’ my translation) which appear in 1QS 5:8. Schofield (2009:90) suggests that the most likely reason for this difference is that the words are a secondary addition in 1QS, a sentiment shared by Metso (2006:288). Whatever the reason for the omission in the 4QS manuscripts, in 1QS the writer obviously emphasises the covenant theme as well as that of willing submission to its rules (cf. Schofield, 2009:90; Metso 2006:288). The seriousness of the commitment entered into is obvious in the phraseology of 1QS 5:8-9 where the writer notes that anyone who thus enters into the covenant must ‘take it upon his soul by an oath of obligation [בשבועת אסר] to return to the law of Moses according to all that he has commanded with all his soul and with all his heart’ (my translation, but cf. Charlesworth & Qimron 1994:21). Metso (2006:297) and Hempel (2010:125) both note the implicit relationship of the oath in this text to Nehemiah 10:30. In Metso’s (2006:297) opinion the redactor of 1QS does not accept Nehemiah as authoritative and therefore seeks to link the oath to the Torah. Hempel (2010:125) however makes the more likely suggestion that considered from another angle one might equally well propose that Nehemiah, CD and the Serekh texts underwent a ‘comparable social development.’⁵⁷³

What is the significance of the expression שבועת אסר in this context? The expression is not very common in either the HB or the DSS.⁵⁷⁴ In the former, it only occurs in Numbers 30:14, a chapter where regulations concerning making oaths are given, in particular vows made by women under the authority of their husbands or fathers. In particular, Numbers 30:3 states, instructing the tribal leaders, that any man binding himself by a solemn vow to the Lord must do exactly what he has promised since he has sworn a solemn oath in God’s name that ‘must not be taken in vain and profaned by swearing falsely (Ex. 20:7; Lev. 19:12)’ (Gane 1995:761). It is possible that the phrase in 1QS 5:8 is modelled on this verse.⁵⁷⁵ Although the exact expression שבועת אסר does not appear in Numbers 30:3, the wording is similar enough to suggest a relationship between that text and 1QS 5:8. In particular אסר ויקים על נפשו בשבועת אסר is reminiscent of הַשָּׁבַע שֶׁבַעָה לְאִסָּר אִסָּר עַל-נַפְשׁוֹ. Metso (2006:288) also suggests that 1QS does not appeal ‘explicitly to Scripture’ here, but that by inserting the word שבועת the ‘redactor of 1QS wanted to create a clearer

⁵⁷³ Rabinowitz (1954) finds numerous allusions to Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah in CD (esp. Rabinowitz 1954:15, 17, 31, 32), and it is plausible that the same applies to 1QS.

⁵⁷⁴ In the DSS the expression occurs seven times, once in the present context (the only occurrence in 1QS), once in CD, twice in the Temple Scroll and also in some fragmentary texts. In each case it seems that a particularly solemn oath is in view.

⁵⁷⁵ The exact wording there is אִישׁ כִּי-יָדָר לְהַנִּיחַ אֶת-הַשָּׁבַע שֶׁבַעָה לְאִסָּר אִסָּר עַל-נַפְשׁוֹ לֹא יִחַל דְּבָרוֹ כְּכִלְיָה־יָצָא מִפִּיו יַעֲשֶׂה.

association with the text of Numbers.’ But why did the author use this particular expression, and in particular the word אָסַר?

In the HB the word אָסַר in the sense of a binding obligation only occurs in Numbers and seems to refer to a negative vow of abstaining from doing something (cf. Wakely 1997:474 and Ashley 1993:574; HALOT in fact gives the definition ‘vow of abstention’). In the present context in 1QS 5:8 the ‘binding oath’ is both a positive turning to the Law of Moses (1QS 5:8-9), and a negative turning away and separation from ‘all the men of iniquity who walk in the wicked way’ (1QS 5:10-11, my translation, but cf. DSSEL). VanderKam (2009:420) also suggests that this is likely ‘the content of the oath.’ The passage in CD 16:7 throws light on the present text: there also the making of vows is regulated. The writer of CD quotes Deuteronomy 23:24, ‘What comes out of your mouth you shall keep,’ and explains that the meaning of this statement is that ‘every binding oath (שבועת אסר) which a man promises to do anything f[rom the L]aw: he may not break it, even at the price of death’ (DSSEL, CD 16:6-8; cf. also 4Q271 (4QD-f) 4ii:8; 11Q19 (11QTemple-a) 53:14-16). The seriousness of the oath in view is clear: not even death must be shunned in order to keep it.⁵⁷⁶

Considering now the reason for the use of the expression שבועת אסר in 1QS 5:8, it seems clear that the author wished to express the seriousness of the oath a new member swore when he entered the community. It was something not to be taken lightly and required significant effort and a willingness to undergo a certain amount of general social ostracism on the part of the new member. That seriousness is also underlined by the two-year ‘novitiate’ that new members had to undergo before they were accepted as full members of the community. That time gave them opportunity to consider and reconsider over and over again the seriousness of the commitment they were embarking on. For those among the members who recommitted themselves with the vow, the covenant renewal ceremony served as a reminder of that seriousness.⁵⁷⁷ The writer continues to clarify that the Law of Moses they swore to keep was interpreted according to ‘all that has been revealed from it to the Sons of Zadok, the priests who keep his covenant and who seek what pleases him, and the multitude of the men of their covenant, those who jointly volunteered for his truth and to live by what pleases him and who have taken it upon

⁵⁷⁶ An interesting section on the making of vows is found in the Temple Scroll, 11Q19 (11QT^a) 53:11-54:5. 11Q19 (11QT^a) 53:14-16 is very similar in wording to the present text. In 11Q19 (11QT^a) 53:16-54:3 vows concerning women are legislated for. In particular it is stated that, if a father or husband forbids a woman to follow through on her vows, she is not obliged to do so and will not incur sin before God. In 11Q19 (11QT^a) 54:2 the exact expression אָסַר שבועת אסר occurs in the context of a married woman making a binding vow in the hearing of her husband.

⁵⁷⁷ Falk (2011:269) observes that 1QS 5:7-9 indicates that the community was a ‘volunteer movement’ which considered itself a ‘restoration movement’, i.e. ‘returning to obeying the Torah’ ... ‘as “revealed” to the leaders’ of the community.

themselves to establish the covenant' (1QS 5:9-10; my translation, but cf. DSSEL & Hempel 2003a:74).⁵⁷⁸

The expression 'men of their [i.e. the priest's] covenant' (אנשי בריתם; 1QS 5:9; cf. also 6:19; 1QS^a 1:2) deserves some comment. Ilg (1978:258) is right to suggest that it refers to the priestly covenant. He observes that the Qumran community reinterpreted OT terms for sacrifice⁵⁷⁹ and temple and used them in a spiritual sense for themselves, saying that they (the Qumran community) were the true temple and that a correct lifestyle could substitute for the sacrifices on the (Jerusalem) altar (Ilg 1978:259; cf. Klinzing 1971:74; 105-106).⁵⁸⁰ Yet in their interpretation there was also room for a hope in a new temple, based on Ezekiel 40-48 (Ilg 1978:259). The biblical foundation for the covenant with the priests comes from Numbers 25, but Ilg (1978:259) first considers Deuteronomy 33:8-11, Moses' blessing of Levi. This text particularly mentions Levi's keeping of God's law and covenant as well as the priest's two-fold task to teach the Israelite God's law and to perform sacrifices, and thus rationalises the call of the Levites as a whole and the Levitical priests in particular. That this 'covenant' is valid is supported by Jeremiah 33:20-22 (Ilg 1978:260), whereas Malachi 2:4ff contrasts the deviant behaviour of the priests at that time with the special relationship that they should have had with God (Ilg 1978:260). Malachi highlights the content of the covenant of God with the priests: God for his part promises the Levites life and peace or welfare (הַחַיִּים וְהַשְׁלוֹמִים), whereas he expects from them that they would fear his name and obey his commands (Mal 2:4-5). Malachi 2:6 continues to

⁵⁷⁸ The words 'those who have jointly volunteered for his truth and to live by what pleases him and who have taken it upon themselves to establish the covenant' (1QS 5:10; וְאֵשֶׁר יָקִים בְּרִית עַל נַפְשׁוֹ) are not present in 4QS^b and 4QS^d. Charlesworth & Qimron (1994:23, n. 103) suggest that these manuscripts may have abbreviated 1QS because that text is 'redundant and a copy for personal use would not need to have the repetitions' (Charlesworth & Qimron 1994:23, n. 103). Schofield (2009:100), however, argues that it is more likely that 1QS was expanded, and that the added words increase the 'sense of hierarchy and more covenantal language,' which would indicate a later development. Perhaps each of the manuscripts simply shows the preference of its author/copyist for his purpose, but if a development from one to the other is indeed the case, I think Schofield's position makes more sense (cf. also Hempel 2006:391). Hempel (2003a:74-75) points out that the 'sons of Zadok' were given an important position in 1QS as special 'recipients of the correct revealed interpretation of the law' (Hempel 2003a:75), whereas in the 4QS tradition this role was shared by the whole community, the רבנים. However, in the present context it is pointed out explicitly that the Zadokites were joined by the other members of the community: 'and the multitude of the men of their covenant.'

⁵⁷⁹ Cf. Sanders (1977:299) who rightly notes that 'righteous acts and piety could substitute for the sacrifices required by the Torah' (cf. also Sanders 1977:302-303). Prayer too, 'rightly offered shall be as an acceptable fragrance of righteousness, and perfection of way a delectable free-will offering' (1QS 9.4f) (Sanders 1977:299; cf. also 1QS 10:6). He also mentions that the community thus takes over priestly functions, in particular the council of fifteen mentioned in 8:1ff (Sanders 1977:302).

⁵⁸⁰ Cf. also Charlesworth & Strawn (1996, esp. 421ff) and the discussion on 1QS 8:10 below. Charlesworth & Strawn (1996:431) believe that the reading of the first visible word at 4Q259 (4QS-e) III (2a ii, 3a-c):1 may be מְקַדֵּשׁ, not לְקַדֵּשׁ, as in DSSEL. They conclude that this reading 'helps substantiate the conclusion that the Qumran Covenanters, or at least some of them ... thought of themselves as constituting a Temple, perhaps not only symbolically but also phenomenologically, which thus replaced the corrupt Temple in Jerusalem' (Charlesworth & Strawn 1996:431). Though I believe they are right in stating that the Qumran community seems to have considered 'themselves as constituting a Temple,' I think they are a little too optimistic in their derivation of this point from this text in 4QS^e, since the reading of the preposition מִן is extremely tentative (Metso 1997:53 does not include a preposition at all and simply reads קַדֵּשׁ after a section reconstructed from 1QS; she observes that if the מ was visible, 'the lower stroke of the letter would be visible,' but it is not). 1QS 8:5ff, I believe, is a better text from which to prove this point.

outline how the Levites originally followed these commands: they taught the nations God's law (Torah), lived themselves holy lives and converted the people. Ilg (1978:260) notes how Levi is presented here as 'law-keeper, law-teacher and mediator of salvation.'⁵⁸¹

The priestly covenant is introduced in Numbers 25:6-13, which reports how Phinehas punished a wayward Israelite who committed adultery with a Moabite woman, and because he thus honoured Yahweh's name among the people he was promised 'the covenant of an everlasting priesthood' (בְּרִית כְּהֻנָּה עוֹלָם, Nu 25:13, my translation; cf. Ilg 1978:260). Because Phinehas obtained God's pardon for Israel because of his zeal for Yahweh's name, he gained a ברית שלום (Nu 25:11; Ilg 1978:260). The same episode is taken up in Psalm 106:29-31 which reports that because of his zeal for God, this deed was 'reckoned' to Phinehas 'for righteousness' (Ps 106:31, NASB: וַתִּחַשְׁבֵהוּ לְוִי לְצִדְקָה; cf. Gn 15:6; Ilg 1978:260-61). Sirach 45:23-24 similarly mentions Phinehas's role in making atonement for Israel (Ilg 1978:261). In all these texts the Levitical priests and Phinehas are presented as preservers of the law who execute judgment on evildoers on God's behalf and thus obtain atonement for the nation (Ilg 1978:261). Specific emphasis is placed on the voluntary nature of their actions, and the fact that they voluntarily live by Yahweh's law (Ilg 1978:261). Because of this they can indeed become the teachers of the nation and thus prevent others from wrongdoing. As a result, they are rewarded with an everlasting priesthood as well as the promise for life and wellbeing ('shalom'). The most important conclusion deriving from these texts is that they are almost completely devoid of cultic language and references (Ilg 1978:261). The promise to Phinehas is not because of his participation in the cult or because of his ancestry, but because of his zeal for Yahweh and his reputation, i.e. his behaviour.⁵⁸²

The significance for the present text is clear: in the DSS, too, similar elements are found, with the distinction that most texts are not restricted to priests, but apply to the community as a whole (Ilg 1978:262).⁵⁸³ It is important that the *Yahad* seems to have believed in a concept of the 'priesthood of all believers' ('believers' = the members of the sect), similar to Paul in the New Testament. This is something that is not apparent in the OT.⁵⁸⁴ In the DSS, only 1QS mentions the special place of the (Zadokite) priests, but the variety of different texts seems to indicate that there were groups among the sect who

⁵⁸¹ Levi 'wird uns ... vorgeführt als Rechtswahrer, als Rechtslehrer, und ... als Heilsmittler' (Ilg 1978:260).

⁵⁸² 'Die Berufung zum Priestertum ist allein an ein bestimmtes Verhalten gebunden' (Ilg 1978:261).

⁵⁸³ As examples one may mention the word נָדַב, voluntary action (מַתְנָדָבִים/נָדָבִים), e.g. 1QS 1:7, 11 etc.; being keepers of God's law (1QS 1:5-6; 5:3 etc.) and the making of atonement (1QS 5:6; 8:6:10) (cf. Ilg 1978:262). Ilg mentions a number of other features, and explains that though they were later playing an important role in the cult, they were not originally dependent on it.

⁵⁸⁴ Ilg (1978:262) also does not believe in a general בְּרִית כְּהֻנָּה עוֹלָם in the OT, although a number of the functions he mentions were taken over by the priesthood, especially that of obtaining atonement, which, with the exception of Numbers 25:13, is always done by priests.

believed in this concept of the ‘priesthood of all believers,’ regardless of the special role that the (Zadokite) priests may have had.⁵⁸⁵

The expression ‘those who take it upon themselves to establish the covenant’ (1QS 5:10, my translation; ואשר יקים בברית על נפשו) is interesting because in thirteen out of fourteen occurrences of קום ברית (or more precisely, הקים ברית) in the HB, it is God who establishes his covenant with the human party. Only once, in a relatively late text at Jeremiah 34:18, is ברית הקים mentioned of humans, and in that case in the negative: they did *not* uphold the covenant they had made before God, i.e. to release slaves. In the DSS, the expression is used eleven times of humans upholding or establishing a covenant they made,⁵⁸⁶ and only seven times of God establishing or upholding his covenant with humans. In most cases the reference is to the covenant by the sectarians to keep the law according to their own strict interpretation of it. This is also the case in the present context. Apart from a simple shift in vocabulary from שמר to קום it is possible that this is also a theological statement by the sectarians: they took their interpretation of the Mosaic laws so seriously, that they used a word that in the HB is used mainly of God for their own upholding of these laws. The same applies to the similar use in 1QS 5:21-22 where it is said that the ‘sons of Aaron who volunteered to uphold his covenant (להקים את בריתו)’ together with the Many shall investigate the suitability of new candidates in the community. The expression ‘sons of Aaron’ appears to be a more general term for the priests, whereas the ‘sons of Zadok’ seems to be a particular group within this larger entity.⁵⁸⁷

The writer then continues to state that those who thus enter the covenant community must separate themselves ‘from all the men of iniquity who walk in the wicked way, for they are not counted in his covenant’ (כי לא החשבו בבריתו; 1QS 5:10-11). ‘Those who walk in wicked ways’ are ‘not considered in His covenant’ (DSSEL: ‘are not reckoned a part of His covenant’) because ‘they did not seek or inquire of Him in his statutes to get to know the hidden things which they erred in’ (1QS 5:11-12; my translation, but cf. DSSEL). Here the writer quotes verbatim from Zephaniah 1:6 to make his point. It is possible that he has in mind the context of the few words he quotes: Zephaniah speaks about God’s coming judgment upon the people Judah and Jerusalem, including idolatrous priests (Zeph 1:4-6). The writer in 1QS points out that the men ‘who walk in the way of the wicked’ even transgress the revealed things (1QS 5:12), which may

⁵⁸⁵ Ilg (1978:263) suggests that this concept was prevalent at a time before the Qumran community itself developed.

⁵⁸⁶ In most of the 18 occurrences the Hiphil is used, but the Piel occurs once (at CD 20:12) and the Qal at least once (definitely at 1QH^a 12:3, and also at CD 16:1, where, however, there is a suggested emendation to the Hiphil).

⁵⁸⁷ A discussion on this issue is beyond the scope of this work, but cf. Hempel (2007) for an interesting analysis of the terms ‘sons of Aaron’ and ‘sons of Zadok’ in the DSS. She comes to a different conclusion from that offered here.

well be a reference to the differences the community had with other Jews, including Jewish leaders and priests. Hempel (2003b:57) makes the attractive suggestion that these ‘men of iniquity’ may have been, at least at some stage, part of the community. They were the ‘haves’ (as she calls it) who may have been regarded by at least some people in the community as authority figures (Hempel 2003b:57). Whoever they were, because of their refusal to understand both the revealed and the hidden things and their failure to act upon any understanding these ‘men of wickedness’ did in fact have, they will incur the anger of God, which will reveal itself in vengeance and judgment upon them according to the covenant curses (באלות ברית; 1QS 5:12). Apparently the writer has in view the curses of such chapters as Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 27 and 28.⁵⁸⁸

The result of God’s judgment on these men will be ‘eternal judgment without remnant’ (Charlesworth & Qimron 1994:23, 1QS 5:13).⁵⁸⁹ For the present, the members of the writer’s community must not associate with such people in any way, nor have any theological arguments with them. Neither are such persons allowed to have any part in their fellowship nor are they permitted to contribute from their personal resources to the community, because they are ‘not accounted within his covenant’ (1QS 5:13-18a; the quote is from 5:18, לא נחשבו בבריתו, Charlesworth & Qimron 1994:23; cf. 1QS 5:11). The author uses a pun on the word *חשב* which also appears in the preceding quotation from Isaiah 2:22.⁵⁹⁰ Covenant here, as in 1QS 5:11, means the sect’s commitment to their strict interpretation of the Mosaic law; yet it is described as ‘his,’ i.e. God’s, covenant (so also in 1QS 5:19). Indeed, people who do not *know* God’s covenant⁵⁹¹ are considered worthless (הבל כול אשר לוא ידעו את בריתו, 1QS 5:19), and the members of the community must have nothing to do with their ‘worthless deeds’ (הבל, 1QS 5:18). Note here the stress on knowledge, i.e. the special knowledge concerning the interpretation of the Mosaic law by

⁵⁸⁸ DSSEL actually explicitly translates ‘the curses of the Mosaic covenant,’ though the expression ‘of Moses’ does not appear in the text.

⁵⁸⁹ The text from ‘ההולכים בדרכי הרשעה’ (who walk in wicked ways) to ‘לאין שרית’ (there will be no remnant; 1QS 5:10-13) is missing in 4QS^b and 4QS^d. Schofield (2009:91) thinks that the text in 1QS 5 is a secondary passage which is not likely to have been lost in the 4Q manuscripts. In her opinion the text ‘better fits the pattern of expansion in 1QS’ and ‘exhibits a more developed understanding of the enemy than ... the parallel versions’ (cf. Metso 1997:80-81).

⁵⁹⁰ Lucas (2010:49) comments on the citation from Isaiah 2:22 in 1QS 5:17, which he translates: ‘separate yourselves from man whose breath is in his nostrils for of what account is he?’ (NASB; חדל לך מן האדם אשר נשמתו באפו כי-במה (נהי-שב הווא). This translation accepts that *חדל מן + חדל* means ‘leave (alone)’ (cf. HALOT on *חדל*), which may thus be interpreted as ‘separate.’ Lucas (2010:49) further notes that the quotation is not completely out of context since it comes at the end of an indictment against Judah’s idolatry and warning against God’s wrath which would terrify the unrepentant (Is 2:5-22). He rightly observes that the following lines (1QS 5:17-18) also point out ‘that those who are not reckoned in God’s covenant will be separated along with their possessions, the very point made in Isa 2:20-21’ (Lucas 2010:50).

⁵⁹¹ Cf. Daniel 11:32 where the violators of God’s covenant collaborate with the wicked king, but those who ‘know their God’ (the phrase is in antithetic parallelism to ‘those who violate the covenant’) will ‘be strengthened and act accordingly (my translation).

the author's community. These people do not have such knowledge and hence their actions are not acceptable to the community.

1QS 5:20-24 concludes the section outlining the procedure to be followed at the yearly covenant renewal ceremony (1QS 5:24), which seemed to have included the admittance of new members. Each (prospective and active) member was investigated by the whole community under the guidance of the 'sons of Aaron who volunteered to uphold his covenant' and 'the Ma[ny] who have volunteered to return in unity [ביהד] to his covenant' (my translation, but cf. DSSSEL, 1QS 5:20-22). After having been admitted, or after the investigation into the conduct of each member, everyone was enrolled 'each before his neighbour' (איש לפני רעהו, my translation; i.e. each one according their rank, 1QS 5:23) according to their understanding and practice of the community regulations (which, of course, are guided by their understanding of the Torah). Older members could be either promoted or demoted, depending on their conduct during the past year. No mention is made of the three-part 'novitiate' that new members had to undergo (this is outlined in 1QS 6:13-23), but the point is emphasised that this procedure was to be followed annually (1QS 5:24). 'Covenant' here once again refers to the sectarians' commitment to follow the Mosaic law according to their strict interpretation of it.

The section from 1QS 5:24b to 6:13 contains various rules regarding how to live together in community when conflicts arose, when eating together, when studying the Scriptures and quite a detailed set of instructions on how to behave during communal meetings. 1QS 6:13-15 states that a new member wishing to enter the community shall be tested by the 'head of the Many' ... 'with regard to his insight and his deeds' and if he is found to be a suitable candidate (lit. 'if he reaches the standard'), the 'head of the Many' shall allow him to enter 'into the covenant to return to the truth and to turn aside from all iniquity, and he shall instruct him in all the ordinances of the *Yahad*' (1QS 6:14-15). 'Covenant' here obviously refers to the community's strict observance of the Mosaic law. The text just cited describes the first stage of the 'novitiate.' The whole community together was involved in the observation of the novice (1QS 6:15-16), and if he was successful, the new candidate was allowed to join the community. However, for a whole year he was not allowed to 'touch the pure food of the Many' nor 'share in [their] possession[s]' (1QS 6:16-17, DSSSE).

After one year, the new candidate was examined again, this time by the Many as well as the 'priests and the majority of the men of their covenant' (על פי הכוהנים ורוב אנשי) (בריתם, 1QS 6:19). The wording here is not easy to follow, but it seems there were two investigations at this stage: first in front of the Many (all full members) and then another

one by a smaller circle of people comprising priests and men designated by the enigmatic term ‘the men of their covenant,’ which perhaps refers to Levites in general or the priests in particular.⁵⁹² If this is the case, it appears that the covenant here may be the priestly covenant; otherwise it is a different way of referring to the covenant of the community. The successful examination resulted in the applicant being allowed to enter ‘the inner council of the Community’ (לקרוב לסוד היחד, DSSSE; lit. ‘to approach the counsel of the *Yahad*’). His possessions were joined to the communal account, though the community would not yet use them, and he was allowed to join the communal meals, but not yet the communal drink until after the completion of another year.⁵⁹³ After another examination at the end of two years, the applicant was admitted as a full member with all the duties and privileges such full membership brought. He was enrolled ‘according to his rank’ (1QS 6:22) and allowed to take part in the meals and drink of the community; his property was joined with theirs, and his counsel was acceptable in meetings. It appears that there were three groups of people in this sect that may even have had separate meetings, especially for meals, though occasionally (at least once a year at the covenant renewal festival) they would all meet together: new novices (still to be instructed – perhaps separately – in the rules of the community); accepted novices who were not yet full members (allowed access to more meetings, including meals, but not drink); and full members (who were allowed to be present at all meetings).

3.3.2.4 1QS 8:1-9:11

After the penal code (1QS 6:24-7:25) in which the word ברית does not appear, 1QS 8:1-9:11 is a lengthy segment whose interpretation has varied. Some believe that it describes the origin of the Qumran community (Metso 1997:123-124)⁵⁹⁴ or comprises the Manifesto of the community that preceded it (Murphy-O’Connor 1969:529), others that it explains the existence of an elite group within the Qumran community (e.g. Berg 2007:162). As will become clear below, in my opinion the last of these options is the most likely.

⁵⁹² For the expression אנשי בריתם see above on 5:9.

⁵⁹³ Garcia Martínez & Trebolle Barrera (1995:153) aptly point out that ‘this whole lengthy procedure is described as a process of progressive purification.’ Daise (2007:157) observes that some of the penalties for defaulters in the penal code (1QS 6:24-7:25) ‘appear to represent a re-enactment, of sorts, of the initiation process at 6:13-23.’ Those who are thus disciplined are re-admitted ‘by being ranked ... again, among the other members of the Community’ according to their station (Daise 2007:157-158). He concludes, probably correctly, by noting that the procedure for new members (1QS 6:13-23), like the re-instatement of offenders, in all probability took place more than once a year when needed, whereas there was a separate yearly covenant renewal ceremony as described in 1QS 1-2 (Daise 2007:159-160).

⁵⁹⁴ So also Knibb (1987) who suggests that 1QS 8:1-4 describes what was ‘to become the nucleus of this group’ (Knibb 1987:129). In a later publication, Metso (1998:224) changes her position and observes that in view of her comparison between 1QS and 4QS^e she no longer believes one can speak (e.g. with Murphy-O’Connor 1969:529) of a community ‘Manifesto.’ It is rather the case that 1QS 8:1-10 is an introduction to the instructions for the Maskil, similar to the instructions at the beginning of columns 1 and 5 (Metso 1998:224).

1QS 8:1 starts by outlining the composition of a special group within the council of the community (בעצת היהוד)⁵⁹⁵ which consists of ‘twelve men and three priests’ (1QS 8:1),⁵⁹⁶ whose task is ‘to keep faithfulness in the land’ and to ‘atone (לרצת, ‘make amends, restore’⁵⁹⁷) for iniquity through righteous deeds’ (1QS 8:1-4). The use of the verb רצה here is interesting as it is very rare in the HB⁵⁹⁸ and with the meaning ‘make amends’ only occurs once in the DSS, here at 1QS 8:1. In the present context it was perhaps chosen because of the reference to Isaiah 40:3 later on, since the word occurs in Isaiah 40:2, and Isaiah 40:3 is quoted at 1QS 8:14.⁵⁹⁹

The writer continues to outline the purpose of this fifteen-member council. Being ‘founded on truth’ they are ‘an everlasting plantation, a holy house for Israel and the foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron’ (1QS 8:5-6, DSSSE). Moreover, as those chosen (presumably by God, but possibly also through the community) they are ‘true witnesses for the judgment’ who will ‘atone for the land and ... render the wicked their retribution’ (1QS 8:6-7). The writer then alludes to and partly quotes from Isaiah 28:16, saying that these people are ‘a tested wall, a costly cornerstone’⁶⁰⁰ which, like the stone in Isaiah, will be immovable. The context in Isaiah is interesting. Isaiah castigates the people of Jerusalem for having made a ‘covenant with death’ and trusting in lies and deception (Is 28:14-15), but God would lay a tested cornerstone and use justice and righteousness as his measuring line. Those believing (presumably in the ‘precious corner stone’) would stand, whereas those who continued to trust in deception would be swept away by God’s judgment. It seems that for the writer of 1QS this ‘elite group’ is this trustworthy cornerstone, whereas the worship in Jerusalem was as false in his own time as in Isaiah’s

⁵⁹⁵ The question is whether this is a special group within the community or whether in the leadership of the community there is a special, elite group (cf. van der Kooij 2011:114f). In 1QS, both the word עצה as well as the phrase עצה היהוד describe the whole community (e.g. 1QS 2:23; 3:2; 5:7; 6:3, 10 etc.; cf. van der Kooij 2011:144), but it appears from the wording of 1QS 8:1 (‘In the council of the community there shall be twelve men and three priests’) and the following description of their tasks and role (1QS 8:2ff) that this is a special, elite group within the whole community rather than a special group among their leaders (so also Collins 2007b:44-46; 2010a:70-72).

⁵⁹⁶ Lohse (1964:281, n. 60) notes that it is unclear whether the writer refers to twelve members among whom there are three priests (cf. Schofield 2009:142, n. 36), or whether he refers to twelve members plus three priests, i.e. fifteen altogether. Both are possible – the former in analogy to the twelve tribes, I presume – but in view of the way the text is presented (‘twelve men and three priests’) I prefer the latter option (cf. Nitzan 2010b:64; Schiffman 2010a:165), which appears to be substantiated by 4Q265 7:7 where it is clearly stated that there are *fifteen* men in the Council of the community (cf. also Sutcliffe 1959:134, n. 2).

⁵⁹⁷ According to the DSSSEL glossary.

⁵⁹⁸ It occurs a total of eight times, five of which are in Leviticus 26 in the context of Israel’s punishment for her sins, when the land will ‘make up’ for its missed Sabbath years (so also for the occurrence in 2 Chr 36:21), and the people for their sins. The word also occurs in Job 20:10 and Isaiah 40:2. This latter verse is important for the present context.

⁵⁹⁹ On the significance of this quotation and textual hints before and after 1QS 8:14 to it see Charlesworth (1997:197-224).

⁶⁰⁰ The Isaiah text reads ‘הגגי יסד בציון אבן אבן במוסד מוסד מוסד המאמין לא יישיש’ (Therefore thus says the Lord GOD, “Behold, I am laying in Zion a stone, a tested stone, A costly cornerstone *for* the foundation, firmly placed. He who believes *in it* will not be disturbed’ NASB). The italics indicate the words quoted in 1QS 8:7. The words בל יודעו (1QS 8:7-8, ‘they shall not be shaken’) seem to give the writer’s interpretation of Isaiah’s words לא יישיש (‘it will not yield,’ my translation; cf. HALOT). Hultgren (2007:280) rightly suggests that the writer paraphrases Isaiah 28:16.

and worthy of God's judgment. Hultgren (2007:280) suggests that the title “‘men of mockery” (אנשי הכזב) used elsewhere by the DSS community ‘is derived’ from this context in Isaiah. He argues that this reference to Isaiah 28:16 may be interpreted to mean that, in the eyes of the DSS sect, God established ‘the rampart as a refuge for the protection of the righteous’ and in response to the scoffers’ (Hultgren 2007:280).

The inner circle is further described as ‘the most holy dwelling for Aaron with eternal⁶⁰¹ knowledge of the covenant of justice’ (1QS 8:8-9, DSSSE) and ‘a house of perfection and truth in Israel’ (1QS 8:9, DSSSE). As such they will ‘offer a soothing odour’ (1QS 8:9, my translation) and ‘establish ... a covenant of eternal statutes’ (1QS 8:10-11, להקים ברית לח. קית עולם; my translation). The expression ‘covenant of justice/judgment’ (לברית משפט, 1QS 8:9) is unique; it appears only here in the DSS,⁶⁰² and never in the HB. What is meant by this phrase is not quite clear, but it appears to refer to the Mosaic covenant as interpreted by the writer's community. The ‘knowledge’ of this ‘covenant of justice’ may in this context refer to the special revelation concerning the interpretation of the Mosaic law by this inner group of fifteen which they can then pass on to the other members (cf. the translation in DSSEL).

Equally unique is the expression ‘a covenant of eternal statutes’ (1QS 8:10). Probably the reference is again to the particular way in which the sectarians interpreted the Law, a suggestion that is supported by 1QS 8:15-16a (see below). But I believe that there is again a theological statement behind this expression: the writer wishes to point out that the interpretation of the Mosaic law as practised by his community is in fact divinely sanctioned and therefore eternally valid, just as the divine covenants in the HB.

The designations ‘foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron,’ ‘costly cornerstone’ and ‘most holy dwelling for Aaron’ and the fact that they will ‘offer a soothing odour’ (1QS 8:5, 7-9) support the view that the author considered this group of fifteen leaders, if not his whole community, as a replacement for the temple.⁶⁰³ Charlesworth and Strawn (1996:430) argue that a possible reading in the parallel 4QS^e III (2a ii, 3a-c):1 is מקדש⁶⁰⁴

⁶⁰¹ I doubt the correctness of this translation. The text reads בדעת כולם, lit. ‘with knowledge of all of them.’ I think that the 2mp suffix either refers to all the members who have this knowledge, or to the covenant stipulations (cf. DSSEL, which translates ‘all of them knowing the Covenant of Justice,’ which makes better sense). Berg (2007:167) reads with DSSSE ‘eternal,’ i.e. עולם. There does not seem to be any warrant for this change, even from the 4Q fragments (4Q258 and 4Q259) which are both restored at the relevant places.

⁶⁰² Though the word משפט has been restored in 4Q259 (4QS^e) II (2ai, 2bd):17, and the whole phrase in 4Q258 (4QS^d) VI (3a-d):3.

⁶⁰³ Cf. Sanders (1977:299-302); Charlesworth and Strawn (1996:430); Hultgren (2008:281); Schiffman (2010a:257f).

⁶⁰⁴ They differ here from DSSEL, which has לקדש, indicating that the ל is not certain, but probable. DSSEL translates the whole line (including reconstructions and the beginning of the next line): ‘[in the foundation of the Community for two years, in perfection of way, they shall be separated] as a sanctuary within the council of the m[en] of [the Community].’ It is interesting that though DSSEL has ל, the translation still is ‘as a sanctuary’ rather than ‘as holy.’

which may refer to ‘a smaller, intra-Community group which alone was designated’ in this way (see also above n. 579). Hultgren (2007:281) however believes that the whole community considered itself as a ‘substitute for the temple’ in fulfilment of Scripture and that this was an early concept in their theology. I think that Hultgren’s view is to be preferred, especially in view of the purification laws of 1QS which apply not only to this special group of fifteen, but all members.

The supralinear correction above 1QS 8:10⁶⁰⁵ once again highlights the purpose of the council of fifteen: they are ‘to atone for the land’ and ‘make decisions’ (lit. ‘decide judgment[s];’ (להרוצ משפט) regarding wickedness. This apparently will only happen after these men have proved themselves for two years, after which they ‘shall be set apart as holy in the midst of the congregation of the men of the *Yahad*’ (1QS 8:10-11; my translation).⁶⁰⁶ Furthermore, they must be instructed in all the knowledge gained by the דורש, and they are supposed to separate themselves by going into the wilderness, according to Isaiah’s call in Isaiah 40:3, which the writer quotes (1QS 8:13-14).⁶⁰⁷ This preparation of the ‘way of the Lord’ is then explained in 1QS 8:15 as consisting of ‘the study (or interpretation, מדרש) of the law (תורה)’ of Moses in accordance with the revelation received ‘from time to time’ and ‘what the prophets revealed through his Holy Spirit’ (1QS 8:16, my translation).

The writer then continues to note that ‘no man of the men of the community, of the covenant of the community (וכול איש מאנשי היחד ברית היחד) who deliberately turns away from any of the commandments must touch the pure food of the men of holiness’ (1QS 8:16-17, my translation). The expression ברית היחד only occurs three times in the DSS: here, in the parallel 4QS^d 6 (3a-d):8 (where only the letters ברית ה are clearly visible; the rest is restored in analogy to 1QS) and in 1QS^b 5:21 (this text is somewhat fragmentary). In 1QS 8:16-17 (and the 4QS parallel), the phrase is in apposition to אנשי היחד and simply seems to clarify who these men in fact are: those committed to the strict interpretation of the covenant by the writer’s community. Brownlee (1951:33, n. 32) suggests that

⁶⁰⁵ Schofield (2009:107) remarks that the correction itself was ‘erased and corrected’ and ‘lost either due to scribal parablepsis, or it was added secondarily to the manuscript.’ Since the text is missing in the parallel text of 4QS^e 2:18-3:1, she thinks that the Vorlage of 4QS^e did not contain these words (Schofield 2009:107).

⁶⁰⁶ This appears to indicate that these are indeed a group set apart from the general community, as argued cogently by Berg (2007:167-168).

⁶⁰⁷ דואא ‘to go into the wilderness, to prepare there a way for the Lord.’ Brownlee (1951:33, n. 29) already noted that דואא is a ‘surrogate for (Yahweh, or Jehovah)’ and believed that the expression is ‘an abbreviation for האלוהים (“He is the God”)’ in analogy to the usage ‘Yahweh, He is God’ in Deuteronomy 4:35 etc. (cf. also Lohse 1964:31; Charlesworth & Qimron 1994:37, n. 210; Schofield 2009:112). This may well be the earliest attestation for the phenomenon that uses the vowels for ‘the Name’ (*hšm*) to indicate that this should be read instead of the Tetragrammaton (Charlesworth & Qimron 1994:37, n. 210). However, unlike Schofield (2009:112), who suggests that 4QS^e 3:4 ‘probably intentionally replaces the Tetragrammaton with the term “the Truth”, האמת,’ Charlesworth & Qimron (1994:37, n. 210) do not believe that the different reading there means that the Aleph in 1QS 8:13 stands for ‘truth’ since that word never ‘was a circumlocution for God.’

'haplography has occurred in connection with the first letter of the word' ברית, which in his opinion should be בברית. He translates 1QS 8:16-18: 'As for anyone of the men of the Community, [in] the covenant of the Community, who wilfully removes a word from all that He commanded, he shall not touch the Purity of the holy men.' The issue is not pertinent for the discussion of covenant. Either way, the expression ברית היהוד is, I believe, a theological statement by the author, who here states explicitly what is implicit elsewhere, namely that what the covenant the members have committed themselves to is their (correct) interpretation of the Mosaic laws.

The text continues to note that a person who turns away from this covenant must first be cleansed from his evil before he can again be admitted to the council according to his rank. This is quite an interesting statement since just a few lines further on similar sins are punished by expulsion from the community (1QS 8:21-23). Both times the expression ביד רמה ('with a high hand,' i.e. deliberately) is used, but in 1QS 8:16-19 the person is simply excluded from the pure food and the decision making process, whereas in 1QS 8:21-23 he is expelled permanently, and the other members of the community are forbidden to have any dealings with him. Perhaps the difference lies in the expressions used for the members. In 8:15 the phrase is 'no man of the men of the community, of the covenant of the *community*' (וכול איש מאנשי היהוד ברית היהוד), but in 8:21 it is 'he who enters the holy *council*' (כול הבא בעצת⁶⁰⁸ הקודש) (my translations). If Berg (2007:169) is right and 8:16-19 is a digression to refer to ordinary members and 8:20ff reverts back to the elite group of fifteen, then the difference may be explicable: these 'holier' men had to live up to a higher standard,⁶⁰⁹ and thus faced stricter sanctions for infringements (cf. Sanders 1977:323f; Berg 2007:170). If a member of this elite group sinned intentionally, he was to be excluded forever (1QS 8:22; 9:1), but if he sinned unintentionally (בשגגה, 1QS 8:24), the punishment was exclusion from the pure meals and the decision making process for a period of two years (1QS 8:24-25, 9:1-2), during which the sinner was to prove his worthiness by a blameless lifestyle, and after which he could be re-admitted 'according to his rank' into the 'holy assembly' (1QS 9:2).⁶¹⁰

1QS 9:3ff apparently reiterates the purpose of the council of fifteen: they are to 'establish eternal truth,' and atone for the sins and transgressions not by sacrifices of flesh

⁶⁰⁸ The word עצה is also used in 8:1 for the fifteen member council.

⁶⁰⁹ Leviticus 21:1-22:16 gives detailed legislation for the behaviour of priests and the High Priest, the religious leaders of the people. The priests were to be set apart in their holiness from the people, but the High Priest even more so (Lv 21:10-15). In the same way, the fifteen men mentioned in 1QS 8:1ff are set apart by special requirements of holiness from the others. I believe that they were the spiritual leaders of the community of whom a higher standard of purity was required, just as the High Priest was the leader of the other priests with a higher standard of holiness required of him.

⁶¹⁰ Berg (2007:170) suggests that this 'probationary period' was 'spent among the larger group, the רבים,' which is possible, but conjecture.

but by prayer (lit. ‘the fruit of the lips,’ 1QS 9:4-5). In this way these men in fact become themselves an acceptable sacrifice (1QS 9:5). 1QS 9:5-6 explains that ‘the men of the *Yahad* shall separate [themselves]’ (my translation), the ‘holy house for Aaron, in order to form a most holy community, and a house of the Community for Israel, those who walk in perfection’ (DSSSE). Moreover, the ‘sons of Aaron’ (i.e. apparently the priests of the group; perhaps another reference to the fifteen-member ‘council’) are given charge of the financial and judicial matters of the community (1QS 9:7). They must ensure that they are set apart from outsiders, in particular the ‘men of deceit,’ (אנשי הרמיה, 1QS 9:8), and do not deviate in anything from the strict rules of the community ‘until the coming of the prophet and the Messiah of Aaron and of Israel’ (1QS 9:10-11).

3.3.2.5 1QS 9:12-11:22

At 1QS 9:12 a new section starts, giving instructions concerning the tasks of the משכיל (‘Instructor,’ DSSSE), and culminating in a song (1QS 9:25-11:22). The word ברית only occurs once in this section, at 1QS 10:10, in the context of the song which perhaps originated from the Teacher of Righteousness. In the context of the line the writer expresses his desire to sing for God’s glory accompanied by instrumental music (1QS 10:9). Furthermore, he says that ‘with the coming of day and night I will enter into the covenant of God, and with the going out of evening and morning I will pronounce his statutes’ (1QS 10:10; עם מבוא יום ולילה אבו{ה}אה בברית אל ועם מוצא ערב ובוקר אמר הוקיו). The parallel construction of the stanza implies that the ‘entering of the covenant’ here does not necessarily indicate some liturgical procedure but the recitation of God’s laws. This may be the only time in 1QS where the writer refers to the covenant in general rather than to the community’s commitment to keep the Mosaic covenant according to their strict interpretation.

3.3.3 Concluding Remarks on בְּרִית in 1QS

Unlike CD which refers not only to the Mosaic covenant, but also the patriarchal and even the priestly covenant, when 1QS speaks about the ‘covenant’ the writer has in mind the Mosaic covenant as interpreted by his community, with perhaps just one or two exceptions. 1QS also uses a number of (almost) unique phrases or uniquely used phrases in connection with ברית חסד (‘covenant of mercy,’ 1QS 1:8); עבר ברית (in the sense of ‘entering the covenant,’ 1QS 1:16, 18, 20, 24; 2:10, 12); לברית עולמים (‘everlasting covenant,’ with עולמים being plural instead of singular, as in the HB); בני צדוק הכוהנים שומרי (‘the sons of Zadok, the priests, the keepers (or guardians) of the covenant,’ 1QS

5:2); אנשי בריתם ('men of their [i.e. the Sons of Zadok's] covenant;' 1QS 5:9; 6:19); 'covenant of justice/judgment' (לבריית משפט, 1QS 8:9); ברית לח.} קית עולם (a covenant of eternal statutes;' 1QS 8:10); ברית היחד ('covenant of the community;' 1QS 8:16).

Though 1QS is not a 'covenant document' in the same way that CD might be considered one, it is nevertheless obvious that covenant is a very important concept for the writer. In fact, in his opinion only the members of his community are true members and guardians of the (Mosaic) covenant, and only they and their leaders can interpret it correctly. The writer makes an important theological statement when he uses the expression עבר ברית to describe *entrance* into the covenant community rather than the breaking of the covenant in 1QS 1-4.⁶¹¹ Just as in Deuteronomy 29, the writer points out that new members are making a complete break with the past when they do so and 'burn their boats' so to speak. By describing the covenant as 'the covenant of eternal statutes' or as 'everlasting covenant' (לבריית עולמים) he emphasises his opinion that the interpretation of the Mosaic law as expressed by his community is in fact divinely sanctioned.

With the term ברית היחד ('covenant of the community') the writer makes explicit what is more or less implicit elsewhere: he refers to his own community as the only legitimate people who can in fact say that they follow the law of Moses as it should be followed.

The fifteen-member 'council' mentioned in 1QS 8:1ff is in my opinion a group of spiritual leaders of whom a higher standard of holiness was required than of the other members of the group, in analogy to the requirement for priests and the High Priest in Leviticus 21-22. The fact that the purpose of this group was to make atonement and themselves become 'sacrifices' (1QS 9:4-5) as well as teach (lit. 'establish truth,' 1QS 9:3-4) also fits this description.

⁶¹¹ Even though later the writer also uses the word in the more normal sense of breaking a statute (1QS 5:7, 14), he never combines it with ברית when he conveys that meaning.

3.4 Explanatory Notes on Selected Sections of the Hymns Scroll (1QH^a) with Special Reference to Covenant Terminology

3.4.1 Introduction: The Nature of the Scroll

The Thanksgiving Scroll is one of the seven scrolls discovered in Cave 1 of Qumran in 1947. Unlike Serekh-ha-Yahad and 1QIsaiah^a which are both quite well preserved, 1QH^a is badly damaged and has many lacunae. Cave 1 also yielded fragments of another copy of the Thanksgiving Scroll (1QH^b or 1Q35), and in Cave 4 fragments of six more copies of the book were found (4Q427-432, i.e. 4QH^{a-e}, and 4QpapH^f; cf. Schuller & Newsom 2012:1). These finds have helped in the reconstruction of some of the missing text of 1QH^a. The 'scroll is dated to the early Herodian period,' i.e. about 30-1 BCE (Schuller & Newsom 2012:1). Since 1QH^a is the most complete of the manuscripts, and since the term ברית actually does not appear in the 4Q fragments (according to a word search conducted in DSSEL), I will concentrate on 1QH^a in this study.

The hymns of the *Hodayot* are generally divided into two major sections, the Teacher Hymns (columns 10-17) and the Community Hymns (all others).⁶¹² The former group was so labelled because they were initially considered to have been authored by the Teacher of Righteousness, though, as Newsom (2004:196) notes, this 'position, at least in its pure form, is now seldom advocated.'⁶¹³ The division is still recognized, but who exactly the 'I' of the hymns is (whether one or more persons), is a matter of debate (Newsom 2004:196). Chazon (2010:135) observes that the Community Hymns are now believed 'to consist of two sub-groups,' and that they differ from the Teacher Hymns 'by their less personal stamp and more general concerns such as the human condition, communal affiliation, and soteriological confession.'⁶¹⁴ As my aim is to show the use of ברית and related terminology, the division into Teacher and Community Hymns will not be as crucial to this investigation as for other topics.

One of the problems of working with the *Hodayot* is the fact that different scholars use different numbering systems for the columns and indeed the lines in the columns. When the scroll was found, it consisted of two parts, one with three sheets of four columns each, i.e. twelve columns in total, and the other consisting of seventy fragments of varying sizes (Schuller & Newsom 2012:1). It was written by two scribes. The first scribe wrote

⁶¹² See Newsom (2004:197). Chazon (1998:266, n. 74) however states that the Hymns of the Teacher comprise columns 10-19 (or 2-9 in Sukenik's edition). This is evidently a typographical error and should read 10-17.

⁶¹³ Schuller & Newsom (2012:1) do note, however, that at least some of these hymns may in fact go back to the Teacher of Righteousness.

⁶¹⁴ Douglas (1999:242, n. 14) argues that 'three literary collections were joined to create the existing scroll,' 1QH^a. In the middle are the 'Teacher Hymns,' and this section is bracketed by the other two collections which he labels 'hymnische Bekenntnislied[er]' (Douglas 1999:242).

columns 1:1-11:22 (of Sukenik's initial counting, taking the three connected sheets as columns 1-12 [Sukenik 1955:39]; now 9:3-19:25 according to Schuller & Newsom's reckoning) and the other scribe the rest. This fact helped scholars in placing the seventy fragments (Schuller & Newsom 2012:1). Initially, the larger of the seventy fragments were labelled columns 13-17 by Sukenik (1955:39), and the remaining fragments simply got numbered 1-66, without attempting any order (except for size; Sukenik 1955:39; cf. Schuller & Newsom 2012:2). The early publications (e.g. Holm-Nielsen 1960; Mansoor 1961) followed this numbering system, but later research resulted in a better and more correct order, with the result that DSSEL and Schuller & Newsom (2012) as well as others follow a different numbering system. This can, at times, be rather confusing. Since I started the research before Schuller & Newsom's (2012) book was available to me, I have used for my research in this section the numbering of columns and lines in DSSEL, even when referring to other scholars' work. For conversion from Sukenik's initial numbering⁶¹⁵ to that of the official DJD 40 version and other 'interim editions' (such as DSSSE), see Schuller & Newsom (2012:4-9), who have produced a very useful conversion table.

3.4.2 The occurrences of **בְּרִית** in 1QH^a

3.4.2.1 1QH^a 4:27

There are twenty-six occurrences of **בְּרִית** in 1QH^a.⁶¹⁶ The first two of these are in rather fragmentary texts, in 1QH^a 4:27 and 6:22, which do not help much in this enquiry.

1QH^a 4:27 mentions the writer's examination of 'every human covenant' (or 'covenant of Adam;'⁶¹⁷ **וְאֵל כּוֹל בְּרִית אָדָם**), but it is not easy to determine what is meant. The expression **בְּרִית אָדָם** only occurs here and in the parallel 4QH^b 1:1 (where **בְּרִית** is reconstructed), and never in the MT.⁶¹⁷ The poem seems to begin at 1QH^a 4:26: '[I give thanks to you, o Lord, for] You have spread [Your] holy spirit over Your servant [] his heart' (DSSEL). 1QH^a 4:27-28 then continues: '[] and I examine every human covenant [] they shall find it [] and those that love it [for] ever and ever' (**שׁ וְאֵל כּוֹל בְּרִית אָדָם אֲבִיט**) [] **יִמְצְאוּהָ** [] **יִגֹּה וְאוֹהֲבֶיהָ** [] **לְעוֹלָמִי עַד** []'; DSSEL).⁶¹⁸ None of this is very clear. Perhaps in line 27 the admission of new candidates is in view, for which the writer gives thanks,

⁶¹⁵ As, for example, used by Holm-Nielsen (1960) and Mansoor (1961).

⁶¹⁶ Schuller & Newsom (2012:90) record 29 occurrences, including some from fragments apparently not included by DSSEL or simply labelled differently.

⁶¹⁷ Hosea 6:7 mentions both **בְּרִית** and **אָדָם** in the same verse, but the precise construction **אָדָם בְּרִית** is not found in the MT ('And they, like Adam, transgressed the covenant;'⁶¹⁷ **וְהֵמָּה כְּאָדָם עָבְרוּ בְּרִית**).

⁶¹⁸ The spaces in brackets give no indication regarding the actual lacunae in the original.

but certainty is impossible. Holm-Nielsen (1960:251, n. 3) observes that the expression *ברית אדם* 'is unique for the Hodayot' and argues that it must be understood 'objectively, i.e. "covenant with people", so that the context comes to refer to the psalmist's joy that God enters into covenant with people.' On the other hand, he admits that the expression could mean "'a covenant into which man enters",' and should that be the case, he suggests that the line might continue: "'But I, behold, I look to all covenants made by man, and all are nothing worth'" (Holm-Nielsen 1960:251, n. 3).

Harkins (2008:147) also observes the uniqueness of the expression *ברית אדם*, not only in the Hodayot, but in the DSS and biblical literature as a whole. In addition, she remarks that this phrase is not only non-biblical, but also non-sectarian, and even in 1QH the expression is one of only two references in that scroll 'where covenant is not understood to be the covenant with God' (Harkins 2008:147). She suggests that this *hodayah* is part of a small cluster of Mosaic *hodayot* in column 4 that were probably not composed by the Qumran sectarians, but included from an outside collection of hymns (Harkins 2008:150). If she is right, my suggestion above that the writer may possibly refer to the introduction of new members to the sectarian group is obviously not tenable. Schuller & Newsom (2012:19) translate the expression *כול ברית אדם* 'the whole covenant of Adam.' It is the only time they translate *אדם* as a personal name. Unfortunately, since there is no commentary on their translation, it is not possible to defend or reject it, though I personally prefer the translation 'covenant of humankind.' In my opinion, it is more likely that *כול ברית אדם* means 'each covenant of humankind' rather than 'the whole covenant of Adam.' If Schuller & Newsom (2012:19) are right, perhaps the reference is to Genesis 1-3. Though the word 'covenant' does not appear in these chapters, some scholars have seen there a general covenant of God with humankind (e.g. Andersen & Freedman 1980:439; Evans 2009:19ff).⁶¹⁹ Nevertheless, I believe that the suggestion made above that the writer here has in view the covenant between (new?) members of his community and God is more likely. However, due to the fragmentary nature of the text, certainty is impossible and one cannot be dogmatic.

3.4.2.2 1QH^a 6:22

The second occurrence of *ברית* in 1QH^a 6:22 is even more difficult, since only part of the word is visible. It seems to come at the end of a prayer that apparently starts in 1QH^a 6:8 (where the words 'I thank you' are restored). The writer praises God for the understanding

⁶¹⁹ To go into the details of the pros and cons of this argument would go beyond the confines of this work. For more details and a positive evaluation of the issue see Berkhof (1938:211–219); Bartholomew (1995:11–33).

he has gained into the destiny of mankind (1QH^a 6:9-13). He goes on to thank God for drawing him to himself, and for those who like the writer also have been chosen, whereas those who remain outside will be judged by God who thus proves himself to be righteous (1QH^a 6:14-16). The second half of the poem basically continues in this vein. The writer again praises God for having been elected and being able to refrain from sinning against God, and for having been brought together with other likeminded people whom he promises to love as long as they, like him, remain steadfast (1QH^a 6:17-19). He refuses to be taken in by the bribes of outsiders or to accept people whom God has removed into his fellowship (1QH^a 6:19-20).

The next line (1QH^a 6:21) is somewhat broken, but the writer says he will not bring into God's council something or someone. The last three letters comprise the word 'they have turned,' but it is debatable whether together with the first word(s) of the next line this should read 'they have turned *to* your covenant' (DSSEL, restoring לָא before 'your covenant', i.e. 'to') or '*away from* your covenant' (Schuller & Newsom 2012:23, restoring נָא; cf. also Holm-Nielsen 1960:219; Mansoor 1961:182, n. 4). In view of the immediately preceding context which speaks of refusing bribes and anything not acceptable to God, the latter option appears to be preferable. The covenant would presumably be the Mosaic covenant, according to the strict interpretation of it by the writer's community. Holm-Nielsen (1960:219-20) suggests that 'the expression, "him that hath turned from Thy covenant"', should be understood more generally of the fallen away amongst the whole people ... and not just among the community, so that the reference [is] to acceptance into the community in general, rather than to reacceptance' (Holm-Nielsen 1960:223, n. 29). Holm-Nielsen (1960:224) also opines that if a non-liturgical situation is in view, the *Sitz im Leben* of this psalm may have been the reflection of the psalmist on 'the place of the individual within the covenant.' The psalmist, in his opinion, recollects how he was first accepted into the community and what promises he made at that time, and Holm-Nielsen (1960:224) suggests that this is reminiscent of covenant initiation ceremonies such as '1QS 1, 2 and 5.'⁶²⁰ Similarly Hultgren (2007:423) observes that the text under consideration (i.e. 1QH^a 6:21-22) 'is reminiscent of the statements about those not included in the covenant in 1QS III, 1; V, 11, 18 and CD XIX, 35; 4Q266 11,6,' and based on this asserts that the author of the poem in 1QH^a 6:8-22 'is a *maskil*.' From the wording of the rest of the poem, Hultgren's view has much to commend it. Perhaps one might even go so far as to say that this hymn goes back to the Teacher of Righteousness.

⁶²⁰ Hultgren (2007:383) sees 1QH^a 6:18-22 as part of the admission process to the community. In his opinion this passage is reminiscent of 1QS 9:15-16.

3.4.2.3 1QH^a 7

Column 7 poses some difficulties in that DSSSE and DSSEL have different line numbers, and in addition, DSSSE and Schuller & Newsom (2012:24-25) insert (part of) another poem before the one in question.⁶²¹ 1QH^a 7:8 (DSSEL; 1QH^a 7:11 in DSSSE) apparently begins a new song ('a Chant for the Maskil') after the word 'blessed' ([... ברוךך]) with 'a Chant' inserted above the line.⁶²² The words 'a Chant for the In[structor ... a loud] cry [for those who magnify (?)]' ([מזמור למש[כיל ... רנה [גדול. ל. המפלי])]) which appear in DSSSE are not reproduced in DSSEL. DSSEL suggests the reconstruction 'are you o Lord' (אתה אדוני) instead. In the following lines (1QH^a 7:9-12, DSSEL) the writer expresses his desire to love God wholeheartedly (ואהבכה בנדבה ובכול לב ובכול נפש, 1QH^a 7:10) and, having purified himself, he is intent on obeying God's laws and commandments without turning aside from them. Hultgren (2007:417) rightly sees in this terminology an allusion to 'the framework of the Damascus Covenant and of the *yahad*.' These lines, according to Hughes (2006:66), comprise part of the first section of this four-part wisdom poem⁶²³ in which the writer is aware that it is God alone who allows a person to be seriously committed to him. Moreover, God has ordained both the 'spirit' which is in a person as well as his works before creating them, and no one can change God's words or decrees⁶²⁴ (1QH^a 7:12-14, DSSEL).

It is God alone who 'created the righteous person, and from the womb' established 'him for the appointed time of favour to be kept in your covenant and to walk in everything and to increase⁶²⁵ upon him the abundance of your mercy' (1QH^a 7:14-16, my translation, but cf. DSSEL: רק אתה [ברא]תה צדיק ומרחם הצינותו למועד רצון להשמר בבריתך עליו). Moreover, God also will 'remove (פתח) all the distress of his soul for everlasting salvation and everlasting peace without want/lack, and thus raise his glory over that of [other] humans' (lines 16-17, my translation, but cf. DSSEL: ולפתוח כול צרת נפשו ולפתוח כול צרת נפשו).⁶²⁶

⁶²¹ DSSSE, however, insert a different one from Schuller & Newsom (2012:24-25).

⁶²² Hughes (2006:65ff) considers 7:8-27 (her numbering follows Schuller & Newsom 2012:24-25, i.e. lines 21-41, which I have put in square brackets) as one poem divided into three sections, with the first and last of these very fragmentary: I. 7:8-12a [21-25a] 'Declaration of Loyalty'; II. 7:12b-22c [25b-35c] 'Wisdom Poem'; III. 7:22d-? [35d-?] 'Confession of Faith?' (Hughes 2006:68). In her opinion section II is a wisdom poem (Hughes 2006:68), but she notes that the reconstruction of line 8 [21] is 'too uncertain to translate' (Hughes 2006:68, n. 25).

⁶²³ Hughes (2006:69) divides the Wisdom Poem into four parts, whereby parts one and four and parts two and three 'correspond with each other.'

⁶²⁴ So with Hughes (2006:66).

⁶²⁵ The word 'increase' (גדיל) is debatable. Both Holm-Nielsen (1960:227) and DSSSE leave it out as illegible. DSSEL however includes it, though with reservation and indicating the letters as possible. García Martínez (1992:323) translates 'to [empty] upon him your plentiful compassion;' Vermes (1998:250), agreeing with DSSEL, has 'that [Thou mightest show Thyself great] to him in the multitude of Thy mercies.' Hughes (2006:67) translates 'And to [rejoice] over him (29) in the multitude of your compassion', reading עלי [גיל] עלי (following Qimron 1989:127-128).

⁶²⁶ Hughes (2006:67) translates: 'and to open all the constriction of his soul for eternal salvation.'

The important phrase here is להשמר בבריתך, which I translated ‘to be kept in your covenant,’ taking account of the Niphal infinitive construct form of the verb. Holm-Nielsen (1960:230), DSSEL (‘to give heed to your covenant’) and DSSSE (‘to keep your covenant’), however translate the Niphal as an active verb. Holm-Nielsen (1960:230, n. 14) argues that the passive translation ‘does not correspond to the next expression,’⁶²⁷ but I am not completely convinced by this argument. Dupont-Sommer (1962:246) also translates the Niphal as a passive construction (‘that he might be preserved in Thy covenant’), and the next phrases: ‘and walk in all <Thy way>, and that he [may go forward] upon it.’ The Niphal infinitive construct of שמר does not appear in the MT. However, the Niphal imperative 2ms appears eighteen times, always with the meaning ‘be careful,’ ‘be on guard’ or ‘take heed for yourself’ (with 2ms suffix), i.e. as an active or reflexive construction, and thus with the same nuance as that indicated by the majority of the translations. The Niphal infinitive construct with the preposition ל appears nine times in the DSS, mostly in very fragmentary texts, but generally with the same range of translations, i.e. either reflexive or as active, with translations in DSSEL ranging from ‘take care,’ ‘keep watch,’ ‘be careful’ to ‘guard it/my-self’ and ‘keep ourselves.’ It appears therefore that the translation as an active construction is justified, yet I would argue that the idea of the writer *being kept* in the covenant by God is not untrue to the context. After all, he is praising God for his election of the righteous and his foreknowledge of the wicked (1QH^a 7:17-19).

The following lines contrast the destiny of the wicked with that of the righteous person⁶²⁸ just outlined. Hughes (2006:70) observes that this contrast is highlighted by the fact that the righteous person is ‘a single individual, whereas the wicked are anonymously plural.’ Unlike the righteous, the wicked have been created from conception for the time of God’s wrath because they refused to walk in God’s ways, rejected his covenant and were not pleased with his commandments (1QH^a 7:17-18).⁶²⁹ Indeed, the wicked chose what God hates, and as a result they will face his judgment (1QH^a 7:18-19). The section finishes by stating that the judgment of God on the wicked will be a ‘sign’ and a ‘portent’ (DSSSE) even for future generations, and that this will reveal God’s glory and power; humans on the other hand are unable to gain understanding or even plan their own life (1QH^a 7:19-21). Hughes (2006:77) observes that the phrase “‘to be for a sign and a por[tent for] eternal

⁶²⁷ This seems to be the accepted opinion, since both García Martínez (1996:323) and Vermes (1998:250) also translate the construction as active. Hughes (2006:67) takes the meaning to be reflexive: ‘To keep (himself) in your covenant.’

⁶²⁸ Who is probably a member of the writer’s community, perhaps even the Teacher of Righteousness himself, or a *maškil*; cf. the suggestion on 1QH^a 6:8-22 by Hultgren (2007:423).

⁶²⁹ DSSEL: ורשעים בראתה [קץ ה]לונכה ומרחם הקדשתם ליום הרגה כי הלכו בדרך לא טוב וימאסו בבריתך [ואמת]ך תעבה נפשם ולא רצו בכל אשר צויתיה ויבחרו באשר שנאתה.

[generations]” is a close match to Deut. 28:46’ and thus appears to indicate the covenant curses upon those who disobey the (Mosaic) covenant (presumably as interpreted by the writer’s community).

It is interesting that all the verbs in the section outlining the fate and the actions of the wicked (1QH^a 17-19) are imperfects, mostly 3mp: הלכו, וימאסו, תעבה, רצו, ויבחרו, not infinitive constructs, as in the description of the righteous man above (only the verb expressing God’s creation of the righteous is finite, a Qal perfect 2ms, the same as in line 17). Perhaps this is not significant, but it seems that the writer emphasises the fact that God is the instigator of the righteous man’s attitude, behaviour and fate, whereas, though he created the wicked as well, they actively refused God’s commandments and covenant, and deliberately went against him (with the implication that they could have chosen otherwise: ‘they choose that which you hate,’ 1QH^a 7:19).

Mansoor (1960:3) lists 1QH^a 7:13-15 and 17-19 among other proof texts to show the sectarian belief in predestination and dualism. Heger (2012) however refutes the notion of dual predestination⁶³⁰ and dualism⁶³¹ in the DSS. His argument concerning the present text deserves to be quoted at length. Heger (2012:336-37) argues that 1QH^a 7:17-18

indicates his [i.e. the author’s] privilege, but it does not attest that others, the non-elected, were damned to be wicked from before their birth. The sole assertion that apparently indicates this ... [he quotes 1QH^a 7:17] is immediately contradicted by the indication of the cause of their predestination to “the day of slaughter.” ... [he quotes 1QH^a 7:21-23] These verses demonstrate explicitly that the wicked will be punished because *they chose, by their own will*, to act against the divine rules, not because they were damned to behave wickedly. God predestined that all who act likewise, who choose the bad way, will be severely punished, in order to serve as a sign and premonition of his boundless might to castigate those who disobey him (*italics added*).

Heger (2012:337-38) continues to outline some of the occurrences of the term בחר (to choose)⁶³² in CD, 1QS and 1QH^a, arguing that the word implies a ‘voluntary act,

⁶³⁰ By this he means the doctrine that holds that some are predestined to salvation while others are predestined to damnation. He admits to the election of those who are saved, but argues that those who are not predestined to salvation are not therefore necessarily predestined to damnation (cf. e.g. Heger 2012:336-337).

⁶³¹ In the Introduction to his book, Heger (2012:3) explains that he refutes in particular the assumption ‘that significant texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls proclaim a dualistic theology of Persian origin and influence and a predeterministic world order for nations and individuals.’

⁶³² בחר appears 172 times in the BHS (Logos word search). Oswalt (1999:100) notes that the root meaning is “to take a keen look at” (cf. Wildberger 1997:209, ‘to fix one’s eyes intently upon’) and observes that when humans are the subject of the verb ‘it always involves a careful, well thought-out choice’ (cf. Seebass 1975:74, ‘very conscious choice and one that can be examined in light of certain criteria’). That falls within Heger’s definition. The definition ‘careful, well thought-out choice,’ also applies where God is the subject (cf. Seebass 1975:76). Furthermore, when God does the choosing, the choice is not arbitrary, but ‘serviceability’ (Oswalt 1999:100). The root always ‘denotes the selection of something or someone from a number of other possibilities’ (Nicole 1997:638; cf. Seebass 1975:83-83). Though ‘*bhr* includes the idea of separating,’ it does so ‘in the sense that the one separated by *bhr* ... stood that much more clearly in the service of the whole’ (Seebass 1975:83). Thus, in the case of God’s choice of Israel, this does not limit him to just this one people, but ‘comes within the framework of God’s plan for the whole world’ (Nicole 1997:641). The reason why God chose Israel is for mission (Nicole 1997:641; cf. Vriezen 1953:109: ‘Die Erwählung ist im A.T. immer die Sache Gottes, seiner Gnade, und enthält für den Menschen immer einen Auftrag’).

referring to the righteous who choose to behave according to God's commandments and to the wicked who choose the opposite' (Heger 2012:338). He also considers some of the occurrences of the terms שרירות לב (stubborn heart) and שוב (in the sense of repent) in the same texts, and remarks that all three expressions (i.e. שרירות לב, בחר and שוב) 'profess ... that the righteous have free will to avoid sinning, and the wicked to sin and repent, respectively' (Heger 2012:338). It appears that the grammatical constructions observed above would substantiate this argument, though Heger does not mention this point: for the actions of the wicked finite verbs are used; for the election of the righteous infinitives are used.

3.4.2.4 1QH^a 8:16

The word ברית occurs again at 1QH^a 8:16 (DSSEL; line 15 in DSSSE). The first eleven lines of this column consist of only a few fragments which do not allow any conclusion concerning the subject matter treated. It is equally difficult to establish whether 'this is an independent psalm, the end of a psalm, or part of the previous column' (Holm-Nielsen 1960:234). Even from line 11 onwards the text is quite fragmented. It is not quite clear what the writer says. There is a reference to God's spirit, the fullness of heaven and earth, and God's truth (lines 12-13),⁶³³ but 1QH^a 8:14-15 seems to imply that somehow the writer acknowledges his failures and confesses his rebellion before God, pleading for mercy (according to the reconstruction in DSSSE). Apparently assured of forgiveness, the writer continues: 'I strengthen myself by [your ho]ly spirit, cling to the truth of your covenant, and [serve] you in truth and with a perfect heart, and love [your name⁶³⁴]' (1QH^a 8:16; my translation, but cf. DSSEL; ולהתחזק ברוח ק[ודשך] ולדבוק באמת בריתך ול[עובד]ך באמת (ולב שלם ולאהוב את [שמך]). In the next two lines the writer blesses God for his creation and great works,⁶³⁵ and expresses his trust that God has indeed dealt mercifully with him because of God's compassion upon him (1QH^a 8:17-18).⁶³⁶

Oswalt (1999:100) notes that if a person or nation does not fulfil the purpose for which they are chosen, God may reject them. In post-biblical use, the nominative is more common than the verb (Nicole 1997:641). In Qumran, *bhr* appears 30 times (Wildberger 1997:225), and the word 'is used as a common designation for the members of the sect' (Nicole 1997:641). The idea of election in the DSS is 'closely [and more directly] linked to the Sinai covenant' than in the OT (Wildberger 1997:226). Like Heger, Wildberger (1997:226) observes that the election of the righteous in the DSS should not be seen as a 'strict determinism,' since the wicked are able to decide which way they go.

⁶³³ Holm-Nielsen (1960:234) summarises: '1-3 ... Heaven and earth are filled with the glory of God ...; '4-5 God has in His benevolence made His truth known....'

⁶³⁴ DSSSE reconstructs 'what pleases you' (רצונך).

⁶³⁵ DSSEL; DSSSE reconstructs 'God of great [coun]sel and many works.'

⁶³⁶ Holm-Nielsen (1960:237) suggests that 1QH^a 8:17 (in his numbering 1QH^a 16:8) begins a new psalm, so that these two lines are not, according to this reckoning, relevant for establishing the meaning of line 16. He also believes that lines 15 and 16 indicate an occasion for OT prayer, 'since it is not the actual content of the prayer which is mentioned, but the reasons for it' (Holm-Nielsen 1960:236).

An interesting feature of 1QH^a 8:16 is the expression באמת בריתך which does not occur in the MT,⁶³⁷ and only once more in the DSS, in the very fragmentary 4Q414 (4Q Ritual of Purification A) 2ii, 3, 4:2.⁶³⁸ Elsewhere in 1QH^a expressions such as ‘counsel of your truth’ (1QH^a 5:6, בסוד אמתך, reconstructed), ‘God of truth’ (1QH^a 7:23,⁶³⁹ אל אמת) or ‘your works of truth’ (1QH^a 9:30, מעשי אמתכה) are found. From a word search conducted in DSSEL it is obvious that for the writer(s) of 1QH^a the concept of truth was a very important one.⁶⁴⁰ What does it mean here?

In the present context, the expression באמת בריתך appears in the sentence, ‘I will cling to the *truth* (or ‘reliability’) of your covenant,’⁶⁴¹ and is followed by the assertion of the writer that he will serve God ‘in *truth* (faithfulness) and a perfect heart’ (ול[עובד]ך באמת) (ולב שלם). In the previous line the writer acknowledges his rebellion against God and apparently seeks and finds forgiveness, as a result of which he can now serve God again. Thus the ‘truth’ of God’s covenant is contrasted with the previous rebellion (פשע) of the writer, but serving God ‘in truth’ is also paralleled with serving God with a ‘perfect heart.’ It seems, therefore, that in 1QH^a 8:16 truth implies proper actions/obedience to God’s commandments as well as an attitude of heart, meriting the translation ‘I will serve you faithfully and with integrity of heart,’ whereas the expression באמת בריתך is probably best translated ‘your reliable covenant.’

3.4.2.5 Excursus: A Survey of the Use of אמת in 1QH^a

Looking at the use of אמת elsewhere in 1QH^a, we find that the first occurrence of אמת in the Hodayot is in 1QH^a 5:10, but this text is so fragmentary that it is of no use for the purpose of establishing meaning. In 1QH^a 6:2 the ‘men of truth (or faithfulness)’ are mentioned, apparently a designation for the members of the community.⁶⁴² The following line seems to imply that these men are people who are seeking ‘understanding’ and are compassionate

⁶³⁷ Only two verses have both words in the same verse, but none of them in the construction ‘truth of [a/your] covenant.’ Isaiah 61:8 reads: ‘כי אָנִי יְהוָה אֱהָב מִשְׁפָּט שֹׂנְאֵי גְזֵל בְּעוֹלָה וְנָתַתִּי פְעֻלָּתָם בְּאַמֶּת וּבְרִית עוֹלָם אֶכְרֹת לָהֶם; NASB: For I, the LORD, love justice, / I hate robbery in the burnt offering; / And I will faithfully give them their recompense / And make an everlasting covenant with them.’ Psalm 25:10 reads: ‘כָּל־אֲרָחוֹת יְהוָה תִּסְדּוּ וְאֶמֶת לְנַצְרֵי בְרִיתוֹ וְעַדְתָּיו; NASB: All the paths of the LORD are lovingkindness and truth / To those who keep His covenant and His testimonies.’

⁶³⁸ Where these are the only visible words ([באמת בריתכה]). The context indicates a ritual washing, but this is all that can be said. This text therefore does not contribute to an understanding of the phrase which appears to have been coined by the writer of 1QH^a.

⁶³⁹ The manuscript uses palaeo-Hebrew for אל.

⁶⁴⁰ Out of 332 occurrences of אמת in the DSS, sixty-six or almost 20% appear in 1QH^a (1QS has forty-four, 4QInstr^d thirty-four, and 1QM thirteen occurrences). Scott (2011:307), using a different computer programme, lists 381 occurrences in total, of which there are 72 in 1QH, 43 in 1QS and 15 in 1QM. In the MT the word occurs only 127 times, much less than in the DSS.

⁶⁴¹ Mansoor (1961:185) translates the line ‘And to be fortified in [Thy ho]ly spirit and to cleave unto Thy covenant *in truth* and to [serve] Thee in truth and in wholeheartedness and love [Thy name].’

⁶⁴² This expression appears also at 1QH^a 14:28; 15:29-30; 17:35 (with some doubtful letters); 18:27; 19:11; cf. also, for example, 1QpHab 7:10; 1QS 4:5, 6; 1QM 17:8.

and humble. A little later in the same column, the writer contrasts ‘those who act wickedly and the men of deceit’ (1QH^a 6:14; פועלי רשע ואנשי רמיה⁶⁴³) with God’s chosen ones who are ‘truth’ (or ‘faithfulness’), just as God himself is ‘righteousness’ (1QH^a 6:15; אתה צדיק (ואמת כול בכיריך (שנה). As those who are near God they do not ‘pervert’ (שנה) his words or speak (מרה, lit. rebel) against his commandments (lit. mouth) (1QH^a 6:14), presumably unlike the men of deceit who do exactly these things. Truth is here mainly concerned with actions and attitudes, but it also has to do with giving true facts in contrast to lies.

In 1QH^a 6:20 the writer states that he will not exchange God’s truth for wealth⁶⁴⁴ nor swap God’s judgments for a bribe ([ולא] אמיר בהון אמתך ובשוהד כול משפטך). In other words, God’s truth is equated with God’s judgments or commandments, which, I believe, form a body of teaching, giving instruction to the reader/hearer on how to behave or not to behave. This is also evident from the occurrence in 7:18-19 where the writer notes that the wicked ‘reject’ (to live by?) God’s covenant and ‘abhor’ his truth by choosing (to do?) that which God hates (וימאסו בבִּרְיָתְךָ [ואמת]ך תעבה נפשם). Note how here ‘covenant’ and ‘truth’ are apparently equated (cf. also 1QH^a 18:30-31), a fact that throws light on the expression ‘your covenant of truth’ (1QH^a 8:16).

God as a ‘God of truth (or faithfulness)’ (אל אמת) will ‘not receive a bribe or a cover-up for deeds of wickedness’ (1QH^a 7:24-25; אל is written in palaeo-Hebrew script).⁶⁴⁵ Here truth is contrasted with deeds of wickedness (עלילות רשעה). However, the fact that the writer considered God himself as truth is evident from 1QH^a 7:40 where the writer says, ‘you *are* truth and all [Your] works are righteous[ess]’ (DSSEL, italics added; אמת אתה וצדק כול מְעִשֵׂיכָה), thus equating ‘truth’ and ‘deeds/works of righteousness.’ Because God’s truth is expressed in acts of righteousness, it is better to translate אמת as ‘faithful’ or ‘faithfulness.’

The expression ‘counsel/foundation of truth’ (סוד אמת) with or without prefixes and suffixes occurs a number of times in 1QH^a. The subject is either God, as in 1QH^a 9:27, or the writer himself, as in 1QH^a 10:10 (where he asserts that he is an ‘object of shame ... to

⁶⁴³ רמיה occurs only 15 times in the MT, with 12 of these in Job (2), Psalms (6) and Proverbs (4), and one each in Jeremiah, Hosea and Micah. The occurrences in Jeremiah and Proverbs are translated ‘negligent’ (Jr 48:10), ‘lazy’ or ‘slack’ (NASB), i.e. ‘lacking proper effort.’ All other occurrences bear the connotation of being ‘deceitful’ or ‘treacherous.’ This seems to be the case in the present context as well. In the DSS the word appears 25 times, but always with the connotation of ‘deceit,’ though the phrase אנשי רמיה has been translated ‘rebellious men’ (1QS 9:8, DSSEL; DSSSE has ‘men of deceit’) as well as ‘men of deceit’ (1QH^a 10:16; 4QS^d 7 (4a i, 4b):7).

⁶⁴⁴ A similar idea is present in 1QH^a 7:23 where the writer says that no (earthly) wealth can compare to God’s truth.

⁶⁴⁵ The expression אמת אל occurs in Psalm 31:6 (the only occurrence in the MT) where the Psalmist expresses his trust in Yahweh, *the God of truth* (or *faithfulness*, אמת), in whose care he has placed his soul, but apart from this expression there is no other correlation between 1QH^a 7:24-25 and that psalm.

of 1QH^a 8 he considers lines 17 to the end of the column (his labels are 16:8-20) as a separate poem (so also DSSSE; Holm-Nielsen 1960:237, n. 1). One could, however, also argue that 1QH^a 8:17 continues the thought of the previous section which had concluded with the writer's repentance and desire to cling to God's truth, though ultimately the question has no impact on the meaning of ברית in the following section.

In 1QH^a 8:17 the writer praises God for his creation and the kindness (חסד) shown to him (8:17-18, DSSEL). He expresses his desire to cleanse himself because of God's righteousness, because apart from God's enablement no human can be righteous in himself. Hence the writer asks for God's cleansing, that he may draw near to God and stand before him because of God's mercy (8:18-23). 1QH^a 8:24 then reads: '[] And do not allow [] before him any affliction which causes a falling away from the statutes of your covenant' (DSSEL; ואל ין [] לפניו כול נגע מכשול מחוקי בריתך כי). Presumably the Mosaic covenant as interpreted by the writer's community is in view here. The expression מחוקי בריתך is unique; in the MT the words חק (statute) and ברית (covenant) are never used, as here, in a construct relationship, and they occur in the same verse only twice (Josh 24:25 and Is 24:5). Obviously the idea is that God's covenant comes with rules and regulations that are to be followed. The writer is apparently asking that God will not allow him to go through such difficult times that he might be tempted abandon God's covenant regulations and, by implication, the covenant community. After this plea, the writer concludes with yet another acknowledgment of God's grace, mercy and forgiveness towards those who keep his commandments and walk in his ways with integrity of heart (8:25-26), which enables him to again plead with God that he may not turn away from the writer (8:27). Though there are a few legible words in line 28, the rest of the column is not preserved.

3.4.2.7 1QH^a 10:20-30

The composition in 1QH^a 10:20-30 belongs to the Teacher Hymns as distinct from the Community Hymns in columns 4-9 and 18-27 (Douglas 1998:109). The blank space at the beginning of the line and the typical introductory phrase 'I will praise/give thanks to you, o Lord' indicate that a new poem starts at 10:20.⁶⁵⁰ The writer praises God for allowing him to come into the community 'of the living' (he calls it literally the 'bundle of the living' or

⁶⁵⁰ The poem is very well preserved, without any doubtful letters. Though 1QH^a 10:20-30 is patterned on OT thanksgiving psalms, it is not a thanksgiving psalm in the strict sense of the term but 'a mixture of ... psalms of thanksgiving, complaint and trust' (Holm-Nielsen 1960:46). Thiering (1963:193-194) sees an extensive chiasmus with the two lines containing ברית being the C and C' part of the eight-part concentric structure (A, B, C, D, Centre, C', B', A'). Kittel (1975:66; 1981:37) prefers to label the structure as an inclusio. Like Kittel (1975:82-83; 1981:47), Thiering detects a number of 'apocalyptic symbols' in lines 25-28 (i.e. גבורים, כלי מלחמותם, חצים, חנית, באש, שאר, קולם, אפעה, ושוה), but she does not further explain what she means by this.

‘the bundle of life,’ Holm-Nielsen 1960:40; בצרור החיים) and his protection from danger, especially from those who were persecuting him.⁶⁵¹ The wording indicates a possible allusion to 1 Samuel 25:29 where Abigail speaks to David, asking him to spare the lives of her husband and his associates who had treated David’s messengers with contempt (see Holm-Nielsen 1960:41, n. 2⁶⁵²).

Whereas his enemies are apparently threatening his life (literally they are ‘seeking’ his ‘soul’, 1QH^a 10:21),⁶⁵³ the writer firmly holds on to God’s covenant (בתומכי בריתה⁶⁵⁴; 1QH^a 10:21-22, DSSEL). The verb תמך⁶⁵⁵ is not found with ברית as object in the OT (Holm-Nielsen 1960:41, n. 6) where the synonym חזק is preferred. Here ‘covenant’ seems to be a summary term for all God’s instructions. The writer (possibly the Teacher of Righteousness, cf. e.g. Douglas 1999:262ff,⁶⁵⁶ though not everyone would agree with this identification; e.g. Hughes 2006:21; Kittel 1975:81-82; 1981:46),⁶⁵⁷ further identifies his enemies as being ‘a worthless counsel of the congregation of Belial,’ (my translation, but see DSSEL 1QH^a 10:22), which seems to imply that they hold some important position, even though they do not accept the writer’s authority.

The writer continues to express his gratitude to God for saving his life despite the attacks of his enemies, but he also knows that they attack him precisely because of his commitment to God. It is only because of God’s grace (ובהסדיכה) that his steps are secure and he is strengthened (והגבירכה) to withstand the opposition of his adversaries (1QH^a

⁶⁵¹ The literal expression is ‘snares of the pit,’ מקשי שחת. Holm-Nielsen (1960:41, n. 4) rightly suggests that ‘pit’ in line 21 ‘is used here as an effective contrast to life,’ but I do not agree with him that this has ‘no special significance in the present situation.’ In fact, the hunting terms used in this passage to describe threats from enemies are in continuity with biblical usage (Hughes 2006:222, n. 151), e.g. Ezk 19:4ff.

⁶⁵² Mansoor (1961:107, n. 11) sees a connection to 2 Sm 22:6, but the only word in common with the present text mentioned there is לקשוי, and so this seems less likely.

⁶⁵³ Elwolde (2010:172) rightly observes the striking similarity of phraseology in this passage (כי עריצים בקשו נפשי) with Psalms 86:14 (עריצים בקשו נפשי) and 54:5 (וְעָרִיצִים בְּקִשׁוֹ נַפְשִׁי).

⁶⁵⁴ The final kaf before *he* ‘shows that there is some uncertainty regarding the application of final letters’ (Holm-Nielsen 1960:41, n. 6).

⁶⁵⁵ The verb appears only twenty-one times in the MT, and with two exceptions (Gn 48:17; Ex 17:12) only in poetic texts. This may have influenced the author’s choice.

⁶⁵⁶ Douglas (1999:262) believes that 1QH^a 10:1-11:3 describes a deep conflict between the writer and his enemies, who differ from him because of his ‘interpretation of God’s “covenant” ... and God’s “service of worship”’, and in particular in their ‘conduct of Israel’s cultic life.’ In his opinion (Douglas 1999:265) 1QH^a 10 was written before the author’s exile into the wilderness (and 1QH^a 12 afterwards) and believes that ‘it is difficult to avoid the logic ... that the Teacher of Righteousness was the author of the “Teacher Hymns”’ (Douglas 1999:266). This is possible, but can of course not be proven.

⁶⁵⁷ Hughes (2006:21), with Kittel (1975:82; 1981:10-11), thinks that the ‘I’ of these hymns refers to the whole community rather than to a particular person, much less the Teacher of Righteousness. In fact, Kittel (1975:81-82; 1981:46) believes that such an identification would deprive it “of its power and theological insight,” since the writer uses ‘apocalyptic imagery’ in order to ‘universalise his experience.’ This, I think, overstates the point. While Hughes (2006:21), who agrees with Kittel, is right to insist that poetic analysis is very important ‘for a proper understanding of the meaning and function of these compositions,’ this does not mean that trying to assign a specific author to a poem precludes a universal application of it. Otherwise no-one could appropriate a biblical psalm that speaks into their situation for themselves. Therefore I prefer Newsom’s (2004:197) stance that the individual hymns (i.e. 1QH^a 10:3-19; 12:5-13:4; 13:5-19; 13:20-15:5; 16:4-17:36) in the Hodoyot were authored by a ‘persecuted leader of the community,’ though whether this points to a particular leader is not certain (Newsom 2004:197). It is, however, not precluded either (cf. also Newsom 2001:9).

10:23-25). He likens their enmity to a siege, a battle with bow and arrows (1QH^a 10:25-26), and to the angry raging of the sea and a destructive hurricane (1QH^a 10:26-27).⁶⁵⁸ Yet despite his desperation and faintheartedness due to their attacks, the writer expresses again his steadfastness in holding on (חזק) to God's covenant (1QH^a 10:28), which, though he does not say so explicitly here, is his only hope and comfort.⁶⁵⁹ Covenant here seems to be a summary term for the Mosaic covenant, or more precisely, 'scripture,' God's word, as conceived by the writer (i.e. texts considered authoritative by him and his community and as interpreted by them).

The psalmist's enemies will finally be trapped in their own snares, whereas the writer is safe in the knowledge that his 'foot stands on level ground' and that he will bless God's name 'far from their congregation' (1QH^a 10:29, DSSEL). This conclusion to the poem is a quote from Ps. 26:12, and according to Holm-Nielsen (1960:46, n. 30) is 'the most complete and literal quotation which is found in the *Hodayot*' (cf. also Elwolde 2007:94). Only two words are different (due to divine name avoidance),⁶⁶⁰ but there are some minor grammatical changes in 1QH^a. Compare 1QH^a 10:28-29 'ורגלי עמדה במישור' with Ps 26:12 'אֶבְרַךְ יְהוָה מִמְקוֹלֵי אֲבָרָכָה שְׂמֵכָה' with Ps 26:12 'יְהוָה יְהוָה' ⁶⁶¹ Holm-Nielsen (1960:40) translates the text, 'My foot standeth in an even place. In their congregation [מקהלים] I will bless Thy name.' In his opinion, the translation "'away from their assembly," i.e., the ungodly's [sic]' for מקהלים is less likely to be correct, since he thinks this sense could 'have been expressed rather more clearly' (Holm-Nielsen 1960:44, n. 26). If this translation is correct, one may argue that 'the *Hodayot*, or at any rate this psalm, were meant for liturgical use in Qumran' (Holm-Nielsen 1960:44, n. 26). However, the preposition מן more likely means 'from' (not 'in'),⁶⁶² and more recent translations, such as DSSEL and DSSSE follow this reading rather than Holm-Nielsen's.

⁶⁵⁸ Lange (2012:260-261), probably correctly, sees in the expression וכהמן מים (1QH^a 10:27) an allusion to Jeremiah 10:13 where the same phrase occurs (הַקָּמֹן מַיִם). However, 1QH^a 10:27 changes the context of these words from a reference to God in Jeremiah to the writer's enemies in 1QH^a, whom Lange (2012:261) identifies as the 'Pharisaic Seekers of Smooth Things.' Lange (2012:261) concludes: 'The example shows that the *Hodayot* employ the language of Jeremiah, but [do] not necessarily ... evoke the meaning of the Jeremiah-reference(s) in question.'

⁶⁵⁹ Newsom (2001:22) considers this line the 'climactic moment in the speaker's confession of simultaneous terror and trust,' where the speaker uses two nouns, נפש and לב, to refer to himself (cf. Newsom 2004:237-238).

⁶⁶⁰ Elwolde (2007:94) believes that the 'similarity with the biblical text results from the work of a later hand' (which seems to be conjecture), and that the replacement of יְהוָה by שְׂמֵכָה may either be an instance of avoiding the *tetragrammaton*, or a genuine textual variant (Elwolde 2007:95).

⁶⁶¹ Holm-Nielsen (1960:44, n. 26) observes that the substitution of מקהלים for בְּמִקְוֵהֵימֵי 'may be just a scribal error, because the 3rd person plural suffix here refers to nothing,' but he then suggests that it is better to keep to the text 'because it is only to be expected that a mistake would have been corrected; thus, "their" must refer to the members of the covenant, who have not been directly mentioned in the psalm.'

⁶⁶² Waltke & O'Connor (1990:212) give the following definitions for spatial uses of מן (which seems to be implied here): (1) 'the place where a thing or person originated;' (2) 'the direction where a thing is located' (the examples they cite do not, however, include the preposition 'in,' but rather 'to'); and, as the more basic use, (3) the 'ablative sense of *mn*, designating movement *away from* a specified beginning point' or (4) 'the designation of origin' (italics theirs).

Elwolde (2007:95) comments that the particular changes made by the writer of the Hodayot here find no other parallel elsewhere, and notes especially the fact that the last two words of 1QH^a 10:29 are in the margin, which in his opinion indicates that they were probably added by a later hand.⁶⁶³ Elwolde (2007:95) then posits that the text may originally have read ‘ופחים טמנו לנפשי נפלו בם ורגלי מקהלים,’ i.e. ‘and the traps they buried for my soul, they fell into them and the feet of their congregation.’ He adds that this ‘apparently signifies that they, together with the members of their congregation, fell into the trap they had set for me, with the final שמחה אברכה perhaps an interjection of joy and relief’ (Elwolde 2007:95). Though this is of course a possible solution, I find the suggestion less convincing than Elwolde makes out, and I prefer to take the whole text into account (cf. DSSSEL, which clearly notes the reference to Ps. 26:12), especially as it has been preserved with the added words, and no alternative manuscript evidence has come to light so far.

Obviously, this poem is deeply indebted to OT language (Holm-Nielsen 1960:45). Holm-Nielsen (1960:45) lists a large number of reminiscent phrases, and states that the poem ‘consists almost exclusively of expressions and phrases from the O.T., to such a degree that it may be justified to speak of a mosaic of O.T. quotations’ (Holm-Nielsen 1960:45).⁶⁶⁴ Thiering (1963:195) agrees and astutely observes that these OT expressions have been weaved together ‘according to a formal pattern’ including chiasmus, listing and what she calls ‘gather-lines.’⁶⁶⁵

Moreover, I believe that there is more to the quotation of Psalm 26 at the end of the poem than Holm-Nielsen admits, and that the writer in fact makes use of the basic argument of at least part of the psalm, even though the exact wording is not necessarily reproduced. Psalm 26 is, according to the superscript, a composition of (or to/for/about) David (דָּוִד).⁶⁶⁶ The psalmist asks God for vindication from his enemies. He expresses his

⁶⁶³ So also Mansoor (1961:110, n. 2) who suggests that the two words ‘are clearly’ from a different hand. Though I am no handwriting expert, looking at the image of the text in DSSSEL, I am not so sure whether the added words are really in a ‘clearly different’ handwriting than the rest of the column. Since none of the other scholars I consulted comment on this fact, I suggest that it is at least possible that the writer, noting his omission, inserted the words later, but that is, of course, speculation.

⁶⁶⁴ Of course this statement depends on how one defines ‘quotation.’ Hughes (2006:44), for example, argues that ‘a quotation [is] a phrase which is marked, explicitly or implicitly, [and is] referring to the words of a speaker who is not the implied speaker of the composition.’ Quotations in this sense, in her opinion, do not appear in the Hodayot with the possible exception of the present text (see Hughes 2006:45, n. 420). What Holm-Nielsen sees as quotations is perhaps more in line with what Hughes considers an ‘allusion,’ which, though having ‘some kind of verbal parallel as the marker’ (Hughes 2006:46), may be either conscious or unconscious (Hughes 2006:45) on the part of the writer.

⁶⁶⁵ She notes that ‘gather-lines’ operate on the principle where one ‘line weaves together several words, one word out of each of two, three, or four consecutive lines, either preceding or following the gather line’ (Thiering 1963:191).

⁶⁶⁶ The preposition ל before names in Psalms superscriptions is notoriously difficult to interpret, and the same applies to similar superscriptions in the Hodayot. A good summary for possible meanings is found in Craigie (1983:33-34): ‘(a) “for” (e.g. for David); (b) “by” (e.g. by David; viz. belonging to David as author); (c) “to” (perhaps in the sense

trust in God and his avoidance of the company (or congregation) of wicked men (קְהַל מְרַעִים); 1QH^a 10:22 mentions the ‘congregation of Belial,’ עדת בליעל (admittedly different wording but a similar concept). Moreover, the psalmist (of Ps 26) will go to God’s house, will continue to walk in integrity, and asks God to redeem him. As a result, his ‘foot will stand on a level place, [and] in the congregations (בְּמִקְהָלֵי) he will bless Yahweh.’ The psalmist describes the wicked men as ‘sinners,’ ‘men of blood,’ ‘men with evil plans,’ men who bribe others (Ps 26:9-10). Earlier he labels them ‘deceitful men’ (מְתִי-שָׁוִא); 1QH^a 10:22 mentions the ‘counsel of the worthless/deceitful’ (סוּד שׁוֹא) and ‘pretenders’ (NASB, Ps 26:4; גַּעְלֵמִים, ‘those who are hidden’), and ‘assembly of the wicked.’

3.4.2.8 Excursus: סוּד in the DSS and the MT

The word סוּד appears 101 times in the DSS (according to a word search in DSSEL) but only twenty-one times in the MT. An interesting feature is that the majority of these biblical occurrences are in poetic texts: six in the Psalms, three in Job, five in Proverbs, once in Genesis 49:6 (also a poetic text and the only occurrence in the Pentateuch), and six times in the Prophets (four in Jeremiah and one each in Ezekiel and Amos, the latter again in a poetic text). HALOT defines the word as ‘confidential conversation’ (e.g. Amos 3:7) or ‘circle of confidants.’ All the occurrences in the MT fit one or the other of these definitions. In other words, in the Bible the word has to do with close, intimate relationships, expressed in confidential talks with a trusted person that may include the revelation of personal secrets that are told to no one else.

“dedicated to”); (d) “with reference to, concerning, about”; (e) “for the use of” (cf. also Weiser 1962:95-99; Kraus 1988:22-23). In the past, the preposition has been taken to imply only category (b), i.e. authorship, but this has rightly been questioned. As Craigie (1983:34) points out, the use of the preposition in different psalm titles gives a different picture. Sometimes the preposition precedes a name (most often David, with or without preceding expressions; e.g. Ps 3:1); on other occasions it precedes a group of persons (e.g. ‘for the sons of Korah,’ e.g. Ps 42:1); occasionally it is used in the sense ‘for use on’ (e.g. Ps 92:1, ‘for use on the Sabbath day’); or in the sense ‘for the use of/by’ (e.g. Ps 102; ‘for the use of/by the afflicted’); or the preposition may be used with a name, but not implying authorship but meaning ‘belonging to’ (e.g. Ps 30:1; ‘for the house of David’) (Craigie 1983:34), or even in the sense ‘belonging to (a collection of hymns)’ (Craigie 1983:35; Weiser 1962:96; see below). While authorship cannot be excluded (after all David is associated with the composition of hymns and called the ‘sweet psalmist of Israel,’ 2 Sm 23:1), it is unlikely that ל has that meaning in the majority of cases. Weiser (1962:96) suggests that the superscription לְדָוִד (‘to/for/about/by David’) precedes the dates when the psalms were put in collections (i.e. Books 1-5 of psalms) and therefore may have initially been used to describe psalms that the Davidic king could use in worship. However, he agrees that it is unlikely that all seventy-three psalms attributed to David were for the use of the king (Weiser 1962:96; cf. Kraus 1988:23). Many psalms do not simply contain the superscript ‘To/for/about/by David’, but are further qualified, sometimes with more or less detailed descriptions of the situation in which David was supposed to have been (e.g. Ps 3:1: ‘A Psalm by David, when he fled from Absalom his son’), or more simply לְמַנְצֵחַ הַקָּוֶה (‘For the Choir director, to/for/by David’ Ps 11:1). Weiser (1962:97-98) suggests that initially in postexilic worship psalms were attributed to the singers who sang them, and that the expression לְדָוִד was used to designate those psalms that ‘were thought to have originated in the pre-exilic royal cult of the temple.’ I am inclined to think that at least those psalms where descriptions of the situation in which David found himself are given do actually go back to him as author, though others consider these ‘historical superscripts’ as later insertions and attempts at introduction which are not necessarily historically reliable (cf. Eissfeldt 1974:452). Kraus (1988:22-23) rightly notes that even if the superscriptions were inserted later, ‘the Jewish community already understood the heading לְדָוִד as a statement regarding the author.’ This probably applies also to headings with other names.

In many of the occurrences this is also true in the DSS, but there the word has in some contexts acquired an additional nuance, namely that of foundation (either metaphorically of someone's worldview, or literally that of a building).⁶⁶⁷ The distribution of the word in the DSS is also interesting: twice in CD (plus two in 4Q fragments); ten times in 1QS (plus two in 4Q fragments), twenty-nine (i.e. almost a third of all occurrences) in 1QH^a, two in 4QH fragments, nine times in the liturgical texts concerned with the Sabbath Sacrifices, and the rest in various other fragments. The two occurrences in CD and the ten in 1QS all refer to either a secret or a secret council, i.e. a confidence entrusted to someone or the company of trusted friends, who may be either positively the *Yahad* or negatively outsiders or evildoers. In 1QH^a most occurrences fall within the definition of 'secret council,' 'circle of confidants,' or 'confidential conversation,'⁶⁶⁸ but there are a few occurrences where the word rather has to do metaphorically with the basis or foundation of one's worldview,⁶⁶⁹ or literally refers to the foundation of a building or firm ground in the earth, such as rocks.⁶⁷⁰

3.4.2.9 1QH^a 12:5-13:4

A new poem starts at 1QH^a 12:5,⁶⁷¹ as indicated by the blank space before the words 'I will praise you, O Lord.' According to Newsom (2004:197) this is one of the hymns attributed to a 'persecuted leader.' Both Newsom (2004:311) and Hughes (2006:127) observe that the poem is linked literarily to 10:3-19, but Hughes (2006:127) believes that despite this relationship, the two compositions do not necessarily come from the same pen (as suggested by Douglas 1998:126), but they are simply linked through a common exegetical tradition. In a detailed study of the poem, Hughes (2006:204) observes a number of key words and phrases, including 'your covenant' (all except one spelled *plene*), which appears six times, three each in the two main sections into which she divides it.

The writer begins by praising God because he has 'made my face shine with/by/for'⁶⁷² your covenant' (האִירוֹתָהּ פְּנֵי לְבַרִיתְכָּהּ, DSSEL, 1QH^a 12:5). This expression is

⁶⁶⁷ Cf. DSSEL Dictionary and Schuller & Newsom (2012:101).

⁶⁶⁸ These include: 5:3; 6:18, 21; 9:27, 38; 10:10, 22; 11:19; 12:25, 28; 13:9, 24, 26; 14:5; 15:34; 18:4; 19:4, 9; 19:11, 16; 20:12; 24:14; frg 63:2.

⁶⁶⁹ For example 5:21; 9:22.

⁶⁷⁰ For example 14:26, 'you set a foundation upon the rock,' though the picture here is apparently used also metaphorically as a reference to God's laws. So also 15:9.

⁶⁷¹ The poem is well preserved, except for some lacunae at the bottom of column 12 and the beginning of column 13, and a small lacuna in line 17. Though it is 'just possible' that a new, short poem begins at the bottom of column 12 and ends at 13:4, this is unlikely, according to Hughes (2006:96).

⁶⁷² Holm-Nielsen (1960:76 and 80, n. 2) translates the ל instrumentally, 'with', whereas Schuller & Newsom (2012:39) translate 'for', as does Mansoor (1961:122). Mansoor (1961:122, n. 5) observes that others understand the ל to mean

unique, since it never occurs in the MT and only here in the DSS, though Douglas (1999:251) argues that it also occurs at 11:3 (Douglas: 11:5) where he restores the very broken line.⁶⁷³ In the MT, the ‘commandment of the LORD ... enlighten[s] the eyes (מִצְוַת יְהוָה ... מְאִירַת עֵינַיִם) (Ps 19:9) and ‘the unfolding (or ‘opening’) of [his] words gives light (פִּתְחַ דְּבִרְיָהּ יָאִיר) (Ps 119:130), but this is not the same as God making someone’s ‘face shine with’ his ‘covenant.’ Usually, God makes his face to shine upon people (as in the Aaronic blessing, Nu 6:25). In 1QH^a 12:5 the idea is perhaps that through God’s revelation of himself in the ‘covenant,’ presumably the Mosaic covenant (as interpreted by the writer’s community), the writer is elated and excited, similar to Moses’ face which shone when he came down from Mt Sinai after his meeting with God and receiving the Ten Commandments (cf. Hughes 2006:105, who suggests that 1QH^a 12:5 may be a ‘subtle typological allusion’ to these texts). De Vries (1965:396) likewise notes that ‘God’s mighty work of giving the new light of revelation is stated as the occasion for the poet’s praise. God has made him no less than a new Moses, causing his face to shine (Exodus 34, 35; cf. 2 Cor. 3, 7f).’ The ‘only other place in the MT where light and covenant are linked is Isa 42:6,’ a text where it is stated that God will appoint his Servant as ‘a covenant to the people, a light to the nations’ (Hughes 2006:105). However, the context there is very different from that in 1QH^a 12:5 and therefore one can at most speak of an allusion.

There are some words missing at the end of 1QH^a 12:5. The writer continues to state that his desire is to seek God who revealed himself to him (1QH^a 12:6). However, then he outlines his distress, caused by people who are not only going astray themselves, but who are also leading others astray from God and reject the writer’s authority (1QH^a 12:7-8). In fact, not only did his enemies reject him, but even his friends have forsaken him and left him alone (1QH^a 12:8-9). The enemies are not identified. De Vries (1965:396) surmises that they may have been the Jerusalem priesthood, but this is of course conjecture. The writer uses the imagery of thirsty people being denied drink to express the fact that his enemies plotted against him and God’s laws and kept even those wanting to learn from doing so, though they will ultimately be caught in their own traps (1QH^a 12:9-11).

The writer acknowledges that despite all their schemes, God will thwart his enemy’s wicked plans (lit. ‘plans of Belial’, 1QH^a 12:12-13) and bring about his own counsel. He then describes the wicked behaviour of his enemies: they are ‘hypocrites’

“in view of, for the purpose of”, understanding that “God has illuminated the psalmist so that he enters the covenant.”

⁶⁷³ DSSEL only has the words **האירותה** and indicates the next few letters as unreadable. Since the phrase **האירותה פני** **לבריתה** does not occur in the MT or anywhere else in the DSS, Douglas (1999:251) suggests that this establishes ‘strong affinities’ between the compositions in 10:23-11:3 (Douglas: 10:34-11:5) and 12:5-29a (Douglas: 12:7-31a).

(Schuller & Newsom 2012:39, DSSSE) or ‘pretenders’ (DSSEL),⁶⁷⁴ they ‘devise the plans of Belial’ (זמות בליעל יחשובו; 1QH^a 12:13-14, my translation; Schuller & Newsom 2012:39 have: they ‘concoct devilish plans’), and they do not seek God sincerely (lit. ‘they seek him with a double heart,’ וידרשוכה בלב ולב, 1QH^a 12:14). As a result, they are not steeped in God’s truth, but are men who are compared to poisonous roots who, by implication, contaminate everybody they come in contact with. They are stubborn, idolatrous, believe ‘lying⁶⁷⁵ prophets’ and are ‘themselves seduced by error’ (1QH^a 12:14-16, Schuller & Newsom, 2012:39). They lead God’s people (perhaps a reference to the writer’s followers) astray with their words because they have neither chosen God’s ways nor obeyed his words (1QH^a 12:16-18). Newsom (2004:323) aptly comments that ‘there is something quite ghastly about this representation of self-perverting knowledge ... [S]uch persons ... exercise their power cunningly, carrying their doubleness into the social realm as people “who hide themselves” (12:13, i.e., “hypocrites” ...).’ Furthermore, she observes that the language used here is reminiscent of Deuteronomy (Newsom 2004:323), but I think that some of the vocabulary is even more evocative of Ezekiel and his invectives against his sinful countrymen.⁶⁷⁶ Deuteronomic influence can be seen in the expression שרירות לבם, ‘the stubbornness of their heart’ (1QH^a 12:16), which occurs (generally with defective spelling, שרירות לבם) five times in Jeremiah (3:17; 7:24; 9:13; 11:8; 13:10) and in Psalm 81:13 (Newsom 2004:323),⁶⁷⁷ and is also quite common in CD (2:17; 3:5, 11; 8:19; 19:33; 20:9), but appears elsewhere in exactly this form only in 1QS (9:10).⁶⁷⁸ The expression ולענה שורש פורה רוש (1QH^a 12:14, ‘a root producing poison and wormwood’) is found in Deuteronomy 29:17 (שֶׁרֶשׁ פְּרָה רָאֵשׁ וְלַעֲנָה).⁶⁷⁹ Holm-Nielsen (1960:83, n. 32) rightly suggests that this may be ‘a conscious quotation,’ and points to Hebrews 12:15 which also mentions the phrase ‘to characterize those who have fallen away from God.’ In other words, the writer likens his enemies to those who break the covenant, whereas he, by implication, holds fast to it.

⁶⁷⁴ נעלמים (Ni pt mp of עלם), lit. ‘those who are being hidden,’ or perhaps better, ‘those who are hiding themselves.’

⁶⁷⁵ In a pertinent comment, Newsom (2004:322-23) remarks that ‘At Qumran the opposite of knowledge is not ignorance, but falsity or perversion.’ She calls this their ‘ideology of truth’, which implies also that the speaker’s enemies ‘cannot be seen merely as wrong or mistaken. They must be liars and deceivers. Lying is a logically interesting phenomenon, because one of the preconditions of lying is knowing the truth. Thus the speaker’s rivals are necessarily posited as having some access to the truth, though the hodayah does not explain exactly how this occurs. ... Their flaw is not in their knowledge but in their will’ (Newsom 2004:323).

⁶⁷⁶ The word מכשול (‘stumbling block’, 1QH^a 12:15) occurs 14 times in the OT, 8 in Ezekiel; זָמָה (‘wickedness, plan, scheme,’ 1QH^a 12:13, in the plural) occurs 29 times in the OT, 13 in Ezekiel; and 36 out of 48 occurrences of גִּלּוּלִים (‘idols,’ 1QH^a 12:15) appear in Ezekiel.

⁶⁷⁷ Moreover, in Deuteronomy 29:18 the expression שרירות לבי is found, and שרירות לבו appears in Jeremiah 16:12; 18:12 and 23:17. Jeremiah of course is heavily influenced by deuteronomic language.

⁶⁷⁸ With suffixes (3mp or 3ms), שרירות לב appears altogether twenty five times in the DSS, of which eight each are in CD and 1QS, one here in 1QH^a, and the remainder in other fragments.

⁶⁷⁹ The context in Deuteronomy is the covenant renewal in Moab, and more specifically the warning to the new generation that had grown up in the wilderness neither to imitate their ancestors who had died in the wilderness nor to copy the customs of the Canaanites whose land they were going to possess (see esp. Dt 29:14-21).

In the following lines the writer shows how God will judge his enemies in accordance with the magnitude of their wickedness. Those who have forsaken (or ‘are estranged from,’ cf. Holm-Nielsen 1960:77; אשר נזורו מבריתכה) God’s covenant will in fact be trapped in their own snares (1QH^a 12:19). Presumably the ‘covenant’ mentioned here refers to the Mosaic Law (as interpreted by the writer’s community). The word translated ‘turned away,’ זור (1QH^a 12:19, DSSEL), is rare in the MT where it only occurs six times, all in poetic or prophetic texts⁶⁸⁰ with the connotation of forsaking or being estranged from either God or human beings, and never in connection with ברית. In the DSS the word occurs only here. It seems to be used as a synonym for סור, which may also be used in the context of defecting from God, though only indirectly for defecting from God’s covenant (Jr 32:42).

The writer continues to list some of the characteristics of God and his people which contrast with those of his enemies, stating firstly what God is not: there is no delusion in his works, nor deceit in his purposes (1QH^a 12:20-21). Whereas the wicked will be ‘cut off’ (line 20), those who are ‘according to [God’s] soul’ and ‘walk in the way of [his] heart’ will be established in his presence forever (1QH^a 12:21-22). The writer himself is determined to hold on to God and his enabling power, which allows him to take a stand against those who despise and reject him (1QH^a 12:22-23).

The writer now turns his mind to those whom he selected, who obey and follow him and who ‘are meeting together for [God’s] covenant’ (1QH^a 12:24, להגועדים לבריתכה, cf. DSSSE), in other words, his own community.⁶⁸¹ Unlike the people in general the writer’s community is ‘responsive to the speaker’ (Newsom 2004:320). Covenant in this line seems to refer not (only) to the Mosaic covenant, but (in particular) to the congregation of the writer’s followers in worship, perhaps even, as Holm-Nielsen (1960:84, n. 54) suggests, the ‘initiation ceremony after the conclusion of the novitiate.’ The phrase ‘meeting together for [God’s] covenant’ is paralleled by the statement ‘those who are sought by me’ at the beginning of the line, which refers to ‘the members of the community in a wider sense’ (Holm-Nielsen 1960:84, n. 54). But obviously the writer exercised some choice in the selection of his companions since they were ‘sought by’ him. The word used for ‘meeting together’ (הגועדים, from יעדל) may be significant here because the root is also used in Exodus in contexts where God says he will meet with his people in

⁶⁸⁰ Isaiah 1:4; Ezekiel 14:5; Psalms 58:4, 69:9, 78:30; Job 19:3.

⁶⁸¹ Cf. Newsom (2004:320), who argues that the poem is concerned with four ‘human actors,’ namely the ‘I’ of the writer, ‘your people’, whom she identifies as God’s people in general, ‘them,’ who are the writer’s opponents, and lastly, the writer’s own community, who ‘are identified as “all who are examined by me,” “who have met together for your covenant,” who “listen to me,” “who marshal themselves together before you” (12:24-25), and in the technical terminology for the sect as “the many” (12:27).’

front of the mercy seat or the tent of meeting (e.g. Ex 25:22; 29:42-43 etc.).⁶⁸² It seems the writer has in mind this idea of a sacred assembly in the presence of God.

In 1QH^a 12:26-27 the writer expresses his assurance that those who ‘array themselves before [God] in the council of the saints,’ perhaps for (spiritual) battle, or as a (spiritual) sacrifice, will not be allowed to go astray, though those who are against God will be destroyed in judgment. The expression ‘those who have arrayed [themselves]’ (וייערוכו) is interesting, since ערך is often used to express the arrangement of battle lines in war (e.g. 1 Sm 4:2), but also for the arrangement of the showbread in the tabernacle (Ex 40:4) or of a sacrifice (Lv 1:8), or the bringing of a lawsuit (Ps 50:21). Holm-Nielsen (1960:84, n. 56) prefers the first option (for battle), though he admits that the last option would fit the immediate context following this expression where the writer says that God will ‘cause their judgment to endure forever and truth to go forth without obstruction’ (1QH^a 12:25; DSSEL).

In 1QH^a 12:27-28 the writer acknowledges that God has given him not only the wisdom to understand God’s word himself, but also to enlighten ‘many’ (רבים, perhaps a hint at the DSS community, but the word is used without the definite article in both lines) with his insights. Though humanity is but sinful and frail and cannot exist without God’s enabling grace, God has in fact made himself known to mankind through ‘the spirit which [he] created for him’ (1QH^a 12:31), especially to those who are willing to do God’s will (1QH^a 12:33). However, as he remembers his own and his ancestors’ sinfulness, the author feels weak, fearful and unworthy in God’s presence (1QH^a 12:34) and forsaken by his covenant (נעזבתי מבריתכה; 1QH^a 12:35, DSSEL), especially as he considers how ‘the wicked have risen against Your covenant and scoundrels against Your word’ (בקום רשעים) (על בריתך וחלכאים על יְבִרְכָה; 1QH^a 12:34-35, DSSEL). Since the parallelism in this last clause equates ‘covenant’ with ‘word,’ it is the Sinai covenant (as interpreted by the community) that is probably in view here.

Yet, there may be more to the expression than is apparent at first sight. The phrase ‘I am forsaken by your covenant’ (נעזבתי מבריתכה; 1QH^a 12:35) is peculiar, since the Niphal of עזב never appears with ברית in the MT. There are basically two different translation options for 1QH^a 12:35 (ואני אמרתי בפשעי נעזבתי מבריתכה). DSSEL translates: ‘I said in my transgression, I am abandoned by your covenant;’ similarly also Holm-Nielsen (1960:78): ‘But I said in my sin, I am deserted by Thy covenant.’ Holm-Nielsen (1960:86, n. 92) does, however, give an alternative, reading the ב on בפשעי causatively and then translating,

⁶⁸² describes negatively those who gathered together and rebelled against God (Nu 14:35; 16:11; 27:3), but positively the people gathered together with Solomon at the dedication of the temple (1 Ki 8:5).

“‘I have been expelled from Thy covenant,” i.e. from the community.’ He adds: ‘If the passage refers directly to the circumstances within the community, the situation in question could be the re-acceptance of an excommunicate, cf. 1QS 6:24ff’ (Holm-Nielsen 1960:86, n. 92). Schuller & Newsom (2012:41) render the phrase more in line with this alternative: ‘And I said, “In my sin I have been abandoned, far from your covenant,’ including the word ‘far’ for a smoother English reading. De Vries (1965:395) similarly translates, ‘Because of my transgression have I been abandoned, outside thy covenant,’ interpreting the preposition מן to mean ‘outside.’ Hughes (2006:101) prefers something more akin to DSSEL and translates ‘And I, I said “In my transgression I have been forsaken from your covenant,”’ noting (at n. 142) that it ‘is unclear where the reported speech begins.’ Whichever of these translations one prefers, it is certainly curious that the writer feels abandoned by *God’s covenant*, not just by God. Therefore, Holm-Nielsen’s alternative reading has much to commend it since it implies that *people* have abandoned the writer, not an impersonal entity. In other words, ‘covenant’ here means the ‘*covenant community*.’ This may also be implied by the previous statement (‘the wicked have risen against Your covenant and scoundrels against Your word;’ 1QH^a 12:34-35). Here, too, ‘covenant’ and ‘word’ may refer to the *covenant community* against which the enemies have arisen. This seems to be confirmed by the following lines where the writer says he remembers God’s power and ‘abundant mercies’, which enable him to stand ‘upright and firm’ and with a strengthened mind against adversity (or: affliction/assault; אקומה ורוחי החזיקה במעמד לפני נגע, 1QH^a 12:36), which may possibly indicate people who opposed him (1QH^a 12:35-37). All this is possible by God’s forgiveness (1QH^a 12:37-38), which ultimately will result in glory to God himself.

The last lines of the poem are very fragmented; in the preserved part of 1QH^a 12:39 the writer asserts that he will hold fast to God’s covenant (אתחזקה בבריתכה) until some no longer preserved event, perhaps ‘forever.’ 1QH^a 12:40 asserts that God is truth and his works are righteousness. The phrase ‘hold fast to God’s covenant’ is in striking contrast to the notion in the previous paragraph where the writer feels abandoned by the covenant. However, if, as suggested, covenant there refers to the community, it is less surprising, as here evidently the Mosaic covenant is in view. Elwolde (2010:165) suggests that 1QH^a 12:34-35 may ‘represent a summary allusion to’ Psalm 78:32-40, though there is no direct verbal affinity. Considering in particular 1QH^a 12:39 and its context, he observes that though there are some verbal similarities (for example, both the Psalm and 1QH^a use the word כפר for atonement, though in different grammatical forms), ‘the presentation of, or reflection on, the biblical text itself was not the goal of the writer’ (Elwolde 2010:165-166). Since כפר and עון are used elsewhere in Scripture, for example in Daniel 9:24, it is in my opinion more likely that there is neither any direct dependence of the present text on

Psalm 78 (Elwolde 2010:166) nor on Daniel 9:24 or other texts, but the resemblances are merely echoes of biblical language.

3.4.2.10 1QH^a 13:5-19

At the beginning of the poem starting at 1QH^a 13:5 the writer thanks God for not abandoning him to his own wicked inclinations or judging him according to his guilt (1QH^a 13:5-6). The rest of the poem employs the imagery of ferocious lions in a variety of ways. Part of line 6 is missing, which makes it difficult to know what exactly the first image implies. However, it seems that 1QH^a 13:6-8 associates the writer positively with ‘lions,’ ‘fishermen,’ and ‘hunters’ who ‘hunt for the children of injustice’ (DSSSEL), perhaps hinting at Jeremiah 16:16,⁶⁸³ where both the words for ‘fishermen’ and that for ‘lions’ appear in the context of God hunting down and punishing those who do evil in Israel. This reading accepts the translation of DSSSEL for *ותשמני במגור עם דיגים רבים*: ‘You assigned my dwelling with many fishermen’ (1QH^a 13:7-8; so also DSSSE, Schuller & Newsom 2012:43, and Holm-Nielsen 1960:8). Mansoor (1961:132), however, reads: ‘Thou hast placed me [i]n terror with many fishermen,’ suggesting that *מגור* is related to Jeremiah’s nick-name *Magor-Missabib* (‘Terror-all-around’) in Jeremiah 6:25 (cf. *מָגוֹר* I; HALOT). Nevertheless, since the writer considers the lions, fishermen and hunters as those who ‘hunt down’ the ‘children of injustice,’ I prefer the translation ‘dwelling (place)’ (cf. *מָגוֹר* II; HALOT). The writer then asserts that it is precisely there that God ‘established’ him ‘for judgment’ and ‘strengthened’ his heart through the ‘foundation/counsel of truth’ (perhaps a deliberate wordplay on *יסוד/סוד* and *אמת/אמץ*: *ישם* (למשפט יסדתני וסוד אמת אמצתה בלבבי).

The next phrase is difficult, as the different translations offered show. The Hebrew of DSSSE reads: *ומזה ברית לדורשיה* (1QH^a 13:9, cf. Schuller & Newsom 2012:42), i.e. ‘and from this comes a covenant for those who seek it’ (Schuller & Newsom 2012:43). DSSSEL however, has *ומיה ברית לדורשיה*, i.e. ‘and waters (?)’⁶⁸⁴ of the covenant for those who seek it,’ apparently adopting Wise’s emendation from *ברית ומיה* to *ומי הברית* (Wise 2003:125, also n. 38; cf. Douglas 1998:127, n. 35). Wise (2003:125) defends his emendation by noting that the ‘Teacher uses water imagery for his teaching throughout his hymns.’ Though Mansoor (1961:133, n. 2) asserts that the manuscript supports the reading *ומזה*

⁶⁸³ Holm-Nielsen (1960:93, n. 13) notes a connection to this scripture as well as Isaiah 19:8. Lange (2012:256-257) observes that the words *דיג* (fisherman) and *ציד* (hunter) ‘are paired only in’ 1QH^a 13:10 (as well as its parallel 4QH^c 1 i:2) and in Jeremiah 16:16. In addition, the expression *דיגים רבים* also only occurs in these two texts, and therefore he rightly suggests that an allusion to Jeremiah is very likely (Lange 2012:257).

⁶⁸⁴ The question mark obviously indicates the tentative nature of this reading by the translator(s).

instead of וּמִיָּה, in my opinion it is an open question, and both readings can be defended, though I think וּמִיָּה is slightly more likely.⁶⁸⁵ The difficulty is then the 3fs suffix הֵ: does this refer to the following בְּרִית or the preceding אִמַּת (assuming that it agrees in gender with its referent), or should one assume, with Douglas (1998:127, n. 35) a misplaced space and read with him and Wise (2003:125) וּמִי הַבְּרִית? In my opinion this last option is indeed preferable and makes most sense in the context. In this case, the phrase ‘waters of the covenant’ seems to refer to the teaching of the writer (and his community?), i.e. his (their?) interpretation of the Mosaic covenant, which those who seek it can find by associating with him (them). If the reading וּמִזֶּה בְּרִית לְדֹרֹשֵׁיהָ were accepted, the word ‘covenant’ would probably mean the *covenant community*, as in 1QH^a 12. I think the former option is more likely, since the preceding lines seem to refer to the experiences of an individual rather than that of a community, but one cannot be dogmatic.

The writer continues to assert that God has protected him from his adversaries, whom he likens to ferocious lions and serpents on the prowl (perhaps a figure of speech for slander). God closed their mouths (1QH^a 13:9), hid the writer from them (lit. ‘sons of Adam,’ 1QH^a 13:11), and revealed his salvation to the writer by ‘hiding’ his law in him (1QH^a 13:11-12). Furthermore, God did not abandon the writer but heard his bitter complaints and saved him (1QH^a 13:12-13).

The rest of the poem basically repeats this sequence, using slightly different terms for the writer (he calls himself ‘poor,’ עֲנִי – lines 13, 14; אֲבִיוֹן – line 16; and ‘wretched,’ רָשׁ – line 14).⁶⁸⁶ He has been saved from the teeth and tongue of ‘lions’ because God shut them up (lines 14-15). The writer has been refined like silver and gold in the fire (lines 16-17), presumably by such slander, as in line 17 he says that he was crushed by the wicked, but God has nevertheless given him a calm spirit and freed him from his attackers (who are again likened to lions, lines 18-19).

⁶⁸⁵ The image of the scroll is difficult to interpret. On the whole I think Douglas (1998:127, n. 35) has a point when he notes that comparison with other *yods* and *zayins* in the vicinity supports the acceptance of the *yod*. Holm-Nielsen (1960:90) does not translate וּמִיָּה, replacing it by (?). In a lengthy footnote he explains that the sequence of letters does not make sense (Holm-Nielsen 1960:94, n. 17). He adds that the translation ‘and waters of the covenant for those who seek it’ is ‘as obscure as the text itself.’ He also rejects the emendation to וּמִזֶּה and suggests that the word could be a mistaken spelling for וּמִיָּה (‘survivors, provisions,’ cf. 1QM 13:8), but he rightly considers this too conjectural. Holm-Nielsen (1960:94, n. 17) ends the note by arguing that the text is sufficiently unclear to replace the word with a question mark. In my opinion this merely confuses the matter further. The word is clearly visible, and whether one reads וּמִיָּה or וּמִזֶּה, the text is not incomprehensible, though of course it is not easy to interpret. Other translations agree with either one or the other of the suggestions: Vermes (1998:167) agrees with DSSEL and translates ‘waters of the covenant,’ whereas García Martínez (1996:337) agrees with DSSSE and translates ‘The covenant, therefore, for those looking for it.’

⁶⁸⁶ Elwolde (2010:169), like Mansoor (1961:134, n. 3) and others, suggests a parallel to Psalm 82:3 where the psalmist asks God to do ‘justice to the afflicted and destitute’ (עֲנִי גֹרֵשׁ הַצָּדִיקִים). Though the present text also uses the two words עֲנִי and רָשׁ, the fact that there are no other similarities mitigates against direct dependence, but since the same words only appear ‘in just one additional passage in the Hodayot, it is less likely that the use of the expression can be explained purely on the basis of statistical probability, and [it is] more likely that the Psalms passage consciously or unconsciously underlay the choice of wording’ (Elwolde 2010:169).

3.4.2.11 1QH^a 13:20-39

The poem contained in 1QH^a 13:20-39⁶⁸⁷ is rightly entitled ‘Revolt Against the Community Leader’ by De Vries (1965:402). It continues some of the themes encountered in the previous poem but the writer is more vicious when describing his adversaries. He starts by praising God,⁶⁸⁸ whose strength and glory are endless, for not abandoning an orphan or despising a poor (DSSEL) or destitute (Schuller & Newsom 2012:43) person, probably referring to himself (so also Newsom 2004:342).⁶⁸⁹ In God’s presence, even the humble (or poor) may stay at his feet with those ‘who are eager for righteousness’ (Schuller & Newsom 2012:43; 1QH^a 13:21-22), and they may, like all faithful people, expect to be delivered from their humble estate (lit. from desolation/destruction, מִשְׂאוֹן).

Then the writer contrasts himself with the humble who have been delivered from their estate. Though there is a lacuna in the text, it is evident that he has, in his own opinion, become ‘a cause of controversy and quarrels’ and ‘jealousy and anger’ (Schuller & Newsom 2012; 1QH^a 13:22-23; [וְאֵי הֵייתִי עַל עַ] [דְּנִי לְרִיב וּמִדְּנִים לְרַעֵי קִנְאָה וְאֵי] even to his closest friends, namely those who ‘entered into my covenant’ (לְבָאֵי בְרִיתִי) (13:23). This is evidently a reference to the writer’s associates in his community who, like he, have taken it upon themselves to live according to the Law of Moses in accordance with the strict interpretation adopted by the sectarians. It may even be a hint that this is the founder of the community, since he speaks about ‘my covenant.’ Though Holm-Nielsen (1960:106, n. 17) warns against hasty conclusions, since the word ברית with first person singular suffix never refers to the community (all, except the present, references to ברית with first person singular suffix are in contexts where God is speaking), there is an analogous use with the first person plural suffix in 4Q471 (4QWarScroll-like Text B) 2:2 where the (admittedly fragmentary) text states that the readers are to ‘keep the testimonies of *our* community’ (DSSEL, italics added). This seems to be a reference to the community, not anything else, and I suggest that the present text can be similarly interpreted. Moreover, the text reads ‘jealousy and anger to those *who entered* into my covenant,’ (1QH^a 13:23, DSSEL, italics added), and the expression באי ברית is ‘the usual designation for the members of the sectarian covenant’ (Mansoor 1961:136, n. 2).

⁶⁸⁷ Whether the poem actually finishes in line 39 is difficult to say. It is possible that it continues, and in fact Holm-Nielsen (1960:99-129) considers what he labels column 5:20-7:5 (DSSEL cols 13:5-15:5) one long poem. Since the word ברית does not appear in 14:1-15:5 I have only considered 1QH^a 13:5-39.

⁶⁸⁸ There is a scribal correction at the beginning of the poem: אֱלֹהִים בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה. De Vries (1965:406) observes that this changes the hymn from ‘a *hodayah* (individual thanksgiving hymn) into a *b^erākāh* (hymnic meditation).’ Even so, considering the content it is more likely an individual hymn. De Vries (1965:406) likewise suggests that the corrector ‘has been misled by the gnomic character of this introduction, but the historic reference of the whole poem indicates that the original formula is correct.’

⁶⁸⁹ The words יתום and רש appear together in Psalm 82:3, the only place they do, but that is the only similarity between the present text and this psalm. Newsom (2004:342) observes that ‘[b]y the second century BCE ... [רש and יתום] were terms that not only drew on the ancient paternalistic ethos of the Near East but also on a specifically religious reinterpretation of those terms as labels of rectitude and piety.’

However, these very same people, who should have been his friends and closest companions,⁶⁹⁰ are now not only causing contention and jealousy, but are also ‘grumbling and complaining’ (1QH^a 13:23; ורגן ותלונה) against him. The whole tenor of the passage is reminiscent not only of the psalms of complaint (cf. Newsom 2004:342⁶⁹¹) but also of occurrences during the wilderness wanderings when the Israelites complained against Moses. The terminology used supports this: רגן, a relatively rare word in the MT,⁶⁹² appears in Deuteronomy 1:27 and Psalm 106:25 in the context of reports regarding the Israelites’ rebellion against God’s command through Moses to go up to Canaan and possess the land. In the four occurrences in Proverbs, the word has to do with a person spreading false rumours or slander about people. The singular noun תלונה does not appear in the MT, but the plural תלונות does.⁶⁹³ In Exodus 16:8-12 it appears 5 times in the context of Israel grumbling against Moses and Aaron, and thus God, about the lack of meat in the wilderness. The reference in Numbers 14:27 is also in the context of Israel refusing to enter Canaan after the report of the spies, whereas the two references in Numbers 17 are in the context of Israel’s challenging Aaron’s leadership of the priesthood. In the present text in 1QH^a 13 the writer seems to feel similarly challenged and exasperated by the enmity and jealousy of his own associates.

The following lines continue to outline this rebellion in more detail. ‘Even those who eat [his] bread have lifted the heel against’ him (1QH^a 13:23-24; גַּם אֹרְכֵי כֶלֶי לַחֲמֵי עָלַי), and those who had been in the writer’s council⁶⁹⁴ have spoken against him perversely ‘with lips of iniquity’ (1QH^a 13:24; my translation). Moreover, he describes these men as ‘rebellious/stubborn’ (סוררים), ‘grumbling all around’ (מלינים סביב), and slanderers (רכיל) who tell God’s secrets to outsiders (lit. to ‘sons of destruction;’ 1QH^a 13:24-25). This whole sequence seems to be an allusion to Psalm 41:5-9 where the psalmist expresses similar sentiments. The wording of Psalm 41:9 is particularly relevant, as it most closely resembles that of 1QH^a 13:23-24: ‘Even my close friend, in whom I trusted, Who ate my bread, Has lifted his heel against me’ (NASB; MT גַּם-אִישׁ שְׁלוּמֵי גַם-אֲשֶׁר-בָּטַחְתִּי בֶן אֹכֵל לַחֲמֵי הַגְדִּיל עָלַי עֶקֶב). 1QH^a 13:23-24 uses the plurals אֹרְכֵי כֶלֶי and הַגְדִּילוּ, and

⁶⁹⁰ They are described as those ‘who eat (or share) my bread’ in 1QH^a 13:23.

⁶⁹¹ Newsom (2004:342) adds that the language used here is ‘not merely descriptive’ but implicitly claims ‘that the speaker’s antagonists are the ones in the wrong.’

⁶⁹² It appears only seven times, Deuteronomy 1:27; Isaiah 29:24; Psalm 106:25; and four times in Proverbs: 16:28; 18:8; 26:20, 22.

⁶⁹³ This, too, is relatively rare with only eight occurrences in Exodus 16:7, 8 (2x), 9, 12 and Numbers 14:27 and 17:20, 25. The related verb לון only occurs fourteen times, in Exodus (5x, chs. 15-17), Numbers (8x, chs. 14, 16, 17) and Joshua (1x).

⁶⁹⁴ The expression is וְאֲנָשֵׁי [עַצְ]תִּי, ‘and the men of my [council]’ (DSSEL). De Vries (1965:404) however apparently restored the lacuna to בְּרִיתִי, since he translates ‘and the men of [my cov]enant,’ but the lacuna is in my opinion too small to warrant this reconstruction. Holm-Nielsen (1960:99) also reads ‘counsel,’ as does Mansoor (1961:137). Schuller and Newsom (2012:43) translate ‘council,’ as does DSSEL (both reading עֲצַתִּי). DSSSE also translate ‘council,’ but they read עַד־תִּי.

expresses the idea of close friends in different terms, but the similarity is nevertheless striking. Although Psalm 41:5-8 uses different terminology to express the enmity the psalmist experiences from his adversaries, the ideas of betrayal and slander are also present. In the New Testament, the betrayal of Judas against Jesus is couched in similar language. In Mark 14:18 Jesus says to the disciples at the Last Supper: ‘Truly I say to you that one of you will betray Me – *one who is eating with Me*’ (NASB, italics added).⁶⁹⁵

After asserting that God has ‘shown [his] greatness’ through him by hiding ‘the spring of understanding and the foundation of truth’ (מעין בינה וסוד אמת), 1QH^a 13:26), the writer continues to outline the negative characteristics of his opponents. Their attack is mainly verbal (cf. Newsom 2004:343), not physical. They ‘plot the destruction of their hearts’ and have ‘lying tongues,’ which the writer compares to the poison of serpents who crawl in the dust (1QH^a 13:26-27).⁶⁹⁶ Like the bards of old they sing their slander to music (1QH^a 13:29-30) and seem incessant in their demands (1QH^a 13:31-32). As a result the writer feels unable to cope and is devoid of strength (1QH^a 13:28-29). He feels physically weak, tormented in spirit, and utterly gloomy (1QH^a 13:30-31; 32).⁶⁹⁷ Though there is a glimpse of hope as the writer acknowledges that God had ‘opened a wide space in [his] heart’ (1QH^a 13:32-33), thinking of his adversaries makes him feel gloomy again: he is bitter and angry, and feels grieved and miserable (1QH^a 13:33-35). The adversaries have ‘perverted the works of God by their guilt,’ (1QH^a 13:36), and the writer feels as if he had been bound with unbreakable chains and locked up in an impenetrable prison (1QH^a 13:36-39).

The question that of course arises is what this betrayal refers to. It has been suggested that it refers to a break among the Essenes, and that the writer here is the Teacher of Righteousness, some of whose adherents actually defected from him and perhaps even betrayed him to the priesthood in Jerusalem (cf. Mansoor 1961:136, n. 2), but it is doubtful whether such a specific event can be inferred from the text. Mansoor (1961:136, n. 2) himself goes on to observe that though certainty is impossible, ‘the mournful complaints of [the present] author become most significant when viewed against the background of inner upheavals within the sectarian order.’ Goff (2004:271-272),

⁶⁹⁵ The implicit reference to Psalm 41:9 of this incident is noted by Lane (1974:502). For someone who shares a meal with a person to then go and betray them is considered a most despicable act (cf. Bratcher 2013).

⁶⁹⁶ The imagery of the serpent crawling in the dust is reminiscent of the punishment on the serpent in Genesis 3.

⁶⁹⁷ Harkins (2011:70) observes that in this *Hodayah*, as in many others, ‘laments are described with great attention to the physicality of the pain and the experiences of the body.’ In her opinion, the present *Hodayah* was written as a response to 1QH^a 11:6-19, this latter text having been read performatively and meditated upon (Harkins 2011:70). This may well be so, but in my opinion the experiences recorded in the present text are more likely the reminiscences of an author who actually experienced the distress described himself, i.e. he really was experiencing persecution and rejection from his own community and not just reliving someone else’s experience. That he used imagery from the other *Hodayah* to do so is entirely possible.

commenting on 1QH^a 13:22-24, suggests that this text ‘can be reasonably read as referring to tension within the Dead Sea sect.’ Newsom (2004:325) speaks of ‘disaffection and conflict with the established leadership’ within a community. She notes that ‘[w]hether or not these Hodayot were written in response to specific, acute situations, their topics would have remained pertinent throughout the life of the sect’ (Newsom 2004:325-326). She further writes that the similarity to the psalms indicates that like the biblical psalmists, the writer(s) of ‘the Hodayot of the leader assume a dual audience,’ namely God as well as the members of his (their) own community. In addition, she suggests that the Hodayot of the leader remained active in the repertoire of the actual leaders of the community long after they were first penned and thus the voice of the Teacher of Righteousness (if he was indeed the one who wrote them) would have remained with each successive generation of community members and leaders (Newsom 2004:327-328). This and the more formal institutionalization of the community exhibited in the *Serekh ha-Yahad* helped to keep it together for so long. Thus ‘the Qumran community found a way to combine institutional authority with elements of personal attachment as it struggled to negotiate the chronic problems of its own marginality in Jewish society and the disaffection of some of its members’ (Newsom 2004:328). Unlike the *Serekh-ha-Yahad*, the Hodayot do not present the issue of disaffection (or defection) dispassionately in the form of legislation, but around the experiences of one person (Newsom 2004:328). In the Hodayot the reader encounters emotions, a vulnerable leader who is severely affected by the discontent and enmity he experiences among his fellows. The opponents are depicted in the starkest negative terms, but so are the feelings of the writer.

In her close reading, Newsom (2004:344) makes the attractive suggestion that one possible scenario for a poem like the present one could have been the sessions of the community where the members reproved each other. In such an environment, “‘refractory murmurers” (1QH^a 13:24-25) could be expected to have been a recurrent problem’ (Newsom 2004:344). It is also interesting that the poem finishes with the complaint of the leader (15:1-5), rather than a renewed expression of trust in God, especially as it starts ‘Blessed are you, o Lord’ (or: ‘I praise you, o Lord’). Newsom opines that an explanation for this may be that it ‘encourages the audience to support the speaker by being the type of community he has described’ in 14:25-33 (Newsom 2004:345).

3.4.2.12 1QH^a 15:6-25

The poem in 1QH^a 15:6-25 begins with the writer thanking God for sustaining him through his strength and preventing him from falling by giving him (lit. spreading out over him) his holy spirit (1QH^a 15:6-7). Furthermore, the writer acknowledges that in times of ‘wars of

wickedness' (1QH^a 15:7) he had been strengthened in such a way that despite 'their threats/disasters' he was 'not discouraged *from*' God's covenant (1QH^a 15:7-8; ובכול חוותם ולא החתתה מבריתכה; so DSSSE). DSSEL translates 'You have not shattered me *for the sake of* Your covenant.' As these two different renderings show, the translation of the preposition מן is not easy. Mansoor (1961:149) for example reads 'Thou hast n[ot] caused me to be dismayed *at* Thy covenant,' whereas Holm-Nielsen (1960:129) interprets lines 7-8 'and in all their destructiveness (8) Thou hast not made (me) dejected (that I wander) *from* Thy covenant.' An additional difficulty is the word translated 'not discouraged,' החתתה, a Hiphil perfect 2ms, without suffix.⁶⁹⁸ The manuscript is torn at this place, so it is difficult to decide which of the options represents the better reading; both are possible. There is no suffix, so the translation 'you have not discouraged/shattered *me*' is somewhat subjective, but perfectly plausible in the context.⁶⁹⁹ Presumably the covenant in view here is the Mosaic covenant as interpreted by the writer's community.

The writer continues to state that rather than making him feel discouraged because of the opposition he faced, God had in fact 'set [him] up' or 'made' him 'like a tower of strength' or 'like a strong/high wall,' and had 'established' him firmly 'on a rock' and given him secure footing so that he would not be shaken (1QH^a 15:8-9). The writer seems to refer to his inner frame of mind which remained firm in the face of opposition. Perhaps because of this, the writer asserts that God had 'appointed' him 'a counsel to the weary' and taught (so DSSEL) or strengthened (so Schuller & Newsom 2012:48-49) him in his 'covenant.' The text is broken in the middle of 1QH^a 15:10, and DSSEL supplies [ות[למדני] ('You [have taught me]), whereas Schuller & Newsom (2012:48) supply [ות[הזק]ני] ('you [have strengthened m]e; Schuller & Newsom 2012:49). The image provided by DSSEL shows a large hole at this stage and apart from the first two letters of the word actually nothing is visible except a tiny little dot at the top of the right hand part of the hole, which could be part of any letter. Therefore any reconstruction is extremely tenuous. Holm-Nielsen (1960:129), for example, reads 'Thou [establishest mine heart in] Thy covenant,' explaining in a footnote that the 'expression is quite obscure' and that the [supposed] suffix could 'refer back to סוד in line 9, or מגדל in line 8, or it may just refer to all the expressions in the previous lines' (Holm-Nielsen 1960:131, n. 10). Because of this uncertainty, it is difficult to ascertain what covenant is being referred to, but probably it is the Mosaic covenant as interpreted by the sectarian community. Since the preposition

⁶⁹⁸ Unlike other scholars, Schuller & Newsom (2012:48) consider the second tau unreadable: they just have החה in the Hebrew text, and simply transliterate this form, resulting in the translation: 'you have not *hht* from your covenant.' This is more cautious, in view of the fact that the manuscript is torn here, but does not solve the problem.

⁶⁹⁹ Cf. Holm-Nielsen (1960:131, n. 4), who comments that meaning of the verb without the suffix is absolute, i.e. 'cause dejection,' but that 'it is clear from the context that the *psalmist* has not been made dejected' (italics added).

attached to covenant is כ, 'in' or 'with,' Schuller & Newsom's (2012:48) reconstruction is perhaps to be preferred.⁷⁰⁰

The whole line is in fact reminiscent of Isaiah 50:4 (cf. Holm-Nielsen 1960:132, n. 10, 12; Hughes 2006:177), though the writer does not use the exact words of that passage. Isaiah 50:4 reads: 'The Lord God has given me the tongue of disciples that I may know how to sustain the weary one with a word.'⁷⁰¹ 1QH^a 15:10 reads: '[And] You, my God, have appointed me as a holy counsel to the weary. You [have taught me] your covenant and my tongue is like one of your disciples.'⁷⁰² In each text the writer asserts that he is a disciple of God and that his task is to encourage others who are weary (or downcast), though different words are used. However, if Baumgarten's translation is accepted (which I think is less likely), this reminiscence falls away. He reads: '[But] Thou, my God, Thou didst make him as a foliage unto a holy counsel and Thou didst [set my heart] in Thy Covenant and my tongue according to Thy teachings' (Mansoor 1961:149). Baumgarten notes that the word he translates 'foliage,' עפיים, is a loan word from Aramaic, עפי. DSSEL and others, however, trace it to the root עַיַי, 'weary,' which in my opinion makes more sense in the context.

The writer continues with an enigmatic statement that seems to mean that those who do not follow God as he does, but are in fact his enemies who attack him and lie about him (1QH^a 15:12), will not be given any word of encouragement, but on the contrary be judged by God. The writer sees himself as the dividing line (cf. Holm-Nielsen 1960:132, n. 18) in this coming judgment: 'For all who attack me You will condemn to judgment, so that in me You might divide between the righteous and the ungodly (בין צדיק לרשע)' (1QH^a 15:12, DSSEL). The same sentiment is expressed in Malachi 3:8 where the prophet notes that God 'will again distinguish between the righteous and the wicked (בין צדיק לרשע), between one who serves him and one who does not serve him.' One is also reminded of the judgment scene predicted by Jesus in Matthew 25:31-46.

Returning to his own status, the writer asserts in 1QH^a 15:13-14 that since God knows the heart and mind of everyone, including the words that are going to be said (lit. every answer of the tongue), God has 'established' the writer's heart in God's teaching and truth and guided his every step 'in paths of righteousness,' thus enabling him to walk continuously in close fellowship with God together with others of likeminded heart (lit. 'in

⁷⁰⁰ Only once in the OT is למד followed by the preposition כ in a similar construction to that used in the present context, in Isaiah 40:14 where Isaiah says about God, 'Who has taught him in the way of justice...?' Elsewhere, the preposition כ, when it follows למד refers to a place or to the people who are taught.

⁷⁰¹ The Hebrew for this is: אֲדַבֵּר יְהוָה גִּמְלוֹתַי לִי לְשׁוֹן לְמוֹדִים לְדַעַת לְעוֹת אֶת־יַעֲקֹב דְּבָרָה.

⁷⁰² Hebrew: [ו]אתה אלי נתת <נ>י לעפיים לעצת קודש ות[למדני] [בריתכה ולשוני כלמודיך].

the realm of the [right]eous,' 1QH^a 15:14). Despite this, the writer did not become proud or rely on his own strength or on other people or his good deeds for forgiveness, but he depended solely on God's bountiful compassion and waited upon his compassion and great mercy (1QH^a 15:15-16; ואני נשענתי ברו' [ב רחמיכה ובהמון] חסדיכה אוהיל).

The imagery that follows in 1QH^a 15:18-19 about plants blooming and shoots growing seems to mean that the writer considers himself the teacher of his community. He says he waited upon God's mercy 'in order to cause the plant (מטע) to blossom and the shoot (נצר) to grow up' (1QH^a 15:18-19, my translation, but cf. DSSEL). Two facts support this interpretation. Firstly, the word for plant used here does not occur in the MT, and appears only seven times in the DSS, four of which are in 1QH^a. However, the related verb נָטַע and noun נֹטַע do occur in the MT, and in Isaiah they appear in figurative language referring to the people of Israel.⁷⁰³ The word נצר appears four times in the MT, three of which are in Isaiah and one in Daniel 11:7. Significantly, the word in Daniel refers to the 'descendants' of the daughter of the King of the North, i.e. to human beings. Two of the three references in Isaiah also refer to human beings: in Isaiah 11:1 it refers to the 'shoot ... from the stem of Jesse,' and in Isaiah 60:21 God speaks of his people as the 'branch of his planting' (so MT; the translation reads 'of my planting'). Incidentally, in this verse both the verb נָטַע and the noun נצר appear together.

Secondly, the writer of 1QH^a then continues to state that, as he finds security in God's strength and since God, in his righteousness, has caused him to stand in (lit. for) his covenant to which he has held on in truth, God also 'appointed [him] as a father to the children of mercy and as a guardian to men of portent' (1QH^a 15:19-21, DSSEL; the quote is from lines 20-21). The expression 'you caused me to stand (up?) for your covenant' (1QH^a 15:19-20; העמדתני לבריתכה) is interesting since it does not appear in the MT, and is also unique to the DSS. The closest expression to the present one in the MT is found in Psalm 105:10//1 Chronicles 16:17, which reads 'He also confirmed it [namely Abraham's covenant] to Jacob for a statute, To Israel as an everlasting covenant' (NASB; Hebrew: ויַעֲמִידָהּ לְיַעֲקֹב לְחֹק לְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּרִית עוֹלָם). However, here God establishes the covenant for Israel, not Israel for the covenant. In 1QH^a 21:13 the writer states that God has brought him into a covenant with himself (להביא בברית עמכה) and 'established (ולעמוד) [him before the judgments of the watchers?].' Once again, God does not establish or make stand the writer in/for the covenant, but before a court of law, as it seems. In addition, the word עמד appears in the Qal, not the Hiphil. The idea in 1QH^a 15:19-20 is obviously that the writer

⁷⁰³ E.g. the noun in Isaiah 5:7 in the phrase 'the men of Judah His delightful plant' (NASB). The verb in Isaiah 5:2 refers to God planting a vineyard, which is, however used figuratively for the people of Israel.

has been firmly grounded in the covenant (presumably Moses' covenant as interpreted by the sectarian community) through God's working in him, and the writer himself has done his part by holding fast to God's truth. Thus he could perform his duty as the 'father' of the members of the community, who, like little children opening their mouths to receive food, willingly listened to his instruction (1QH^a 15:20-21). Moreover, God had also given him victory over his opponents (lit. 'lifted up' his 'horn') and scattered them (1QH^a 15:22-23) and in fact raised the writer over his opponents. The writer therefore is enabled to shine in the light of God's glory, especially since God himself is his light through which his feet are 'established on level ground' (1QH^a 15:24-25).

3.4.2.13 1QH^a 18:14-19:2

The text of column 18 is badly damaged. DSSSEL inserts fragment 10 between columns 18 and 19, but DSSSE and Schuller & Newsom (2012) both continue to column 19 (as do Baumgarten [1961] and Holm-Nielsen [1960]); I shall adopt this division. Holm-Nielsen (1960:183) suggests that 'the psalm can be classified as a hymn.' It is inspired by God's salvation which he 'has revealed within the community of the covenant' (Holm-Nielsen 1960:183).

The poem in this section begins 'Blessed are you, O Lord' (ברוך אתה אדוני). The writer is grateful for God's compassion and kindness, and his revelation to him, which enables him to declare God's wonderful deeds to others (1QH^a 18:14-15). He is also grateful for God's goodness and delights in his forgiveness (1QH^a 18:15-16). The next few lines are very fragmentary. Holm-Nielsen (1960:182) notes that lines 17-19 'are a normal declaration of confidence.' At 1QH^a 18:20 a new stanza begins. The writer praises God's glory and notes that he tells others of his wonderful deeds (1QH^a 18:20-21). He hopes in God's compassion and forgiveness, and acknowledges that he only exists because God has formed his spirit in him and established him (1QH^a 18:21-22). Holm-Nielsen (1960:182) suggests that this indicates the writer's 'position in the community.'

Though rich people may place their confidence in their possessions, the writer knows that God has not accepted him because of unjust riches or earthly gain. He is also rich, though not in earthly goods, but in the knowledge of God's truth (1QH^a 18:23-29). In fact, the writer abhors worldly wealth and luxury (cf. Holm-Nielsen 1960:177), especially if unjustly gained, but rather rejoices in God's covenant and delights in his truth (1QH^a 18:29-30). Here covenant probably refers to the whole of 'scripture' that is known to the writer, as the parallelism 'my heart rejoiced in your covenant' // 'your truth delighted my soul' indicates (DSSSEL; שש לבי בבריתכה ואמתכה תשעשע נפשי). The MT does not use the verb

שׂוֹשׁ with בְּרִית, but the idea of someone rejoicing in God’s word is present in Psalm 119, especially in verses 14 and 162 (cf. Mansoor 1961:166, n. 10).⁷⁰⁴ Psalm 119:14 (NASB) says: ‘I have rejoiced in the way of Your testimonies As much as in all riches;’ and Psalm 119:162 (NASB) reads: ‘I rejoice at Your word, As one who finds great spoil.’ Both verses use the verb שׂוֹשׁ. The word used to express the writer’s delight in God’s truth (1QH^a 18:31), שָׁעַע (here in the Hithpalpel), occurs only 5 times in the MT, but one of these occurrences is in Psalm 119:16 where the psalmist says he delights in God’s statutes.

The positive picture presented so far continues until 1QH^a 18:32a: the writer says he blossoms like a lily, his heart ‘is opened to the eternal spring’ and he finds his ‘support in the strength from on high’ (1QH^a 18:31-32, DSSEL). However, after a lacuna in the text, the writer changes his tone completely and expresses extreme anguish and fear: his loins tremble, and he is so depressed he feels as if he has passed through the whole depth of Sheol. As he thinks of God’s judgment, his fear becomes greater and greater (1QH^a 18:32b-36). Here the text breaks off, but 1QH^a 19:1-2 continues this image of fear and trepidation.

3.4.2.14 1QH^a 21-22

Columns 21-22 are rather fragmented, and therefore it is impossible to discern the exact limitations of the poem(s) contained in them. The word בְּרִית occurs three times in these two columns, at 21:9, 13 and at 22:11 (DSSEL). Schuller and Newsom (2012:90), counting the lines differently and including fragments labelled differently by DSSEL, have four occurrences, at 21:10, 14 and 22:15, 27 (22:27 is identical with 1QH^a IV:8 in DSSEL⁷⁰⁵, which in fact is inserted between columns 22 and 23 there). Schuller & Newsom (2012:10) consider columns 20:7-22:43 (or 22:34) one long poem; Holm-Nielsen (1960:252ff) considers what he labels column 18 one poem (cf. especially p. 254, n. 1; DSSEL 21:1-16 = 18:16-32 Holm-Nielsen).

At the beginning of 1QH^a 21, after a reference to the ‘[tra]nsgression of one born of wo[man]’ (1QH^a 21:1) and God’s righteousness (1QH^a 21:2), the writer notes that unless God opens his eyes and ears, he cannot see or hear (presumably God’s words and ways; 1QH^a 21:4-5). The next line refers to those who are ‘uncircumcised of heart’ who apparently also heard ‘wonders’ (according to the reconstruction by Schuller & Newsom

⁷⁰⁴ Holm-Nielsen (1960:181, n. 30) also refers to this text and adds Isaiah 66:14, which reads (NASB): ‘Then you will see *this*, and your heart will be glad, And your bones will flourish like the new grass.’

⁷⁰⁵ I use the capital Roman numeral IV instead of their Arabic numeral, since I used Arabic Numerals for their capital Roman numerals.

2012:65). The writer then asks ‘What is flesh...’ (1QH^a 21:6) but the beginning of line 7 is missing, so it is impossible to say how he continues. Though the question’s beginning is reminiscent of Psalm 8:5 (which, however, reads ‘What is man...’), 1QH^a 21:7 continues in quite a different manner to this psalm. The writer acknowledges that God acts ‘wonderfully’ and for his own glory (21:7) so that he can make these deeds and his laws known to humans (21:8). He continues to state that God had ‘brought into a covenant with’ him someone (21:9, DSSEL, *הבי[א]וֹתָהּ בְּרִית עִמָּכָה*), but the lacuna in the text does not allow conclusions as to who exactly is meant. Presumably the covenant here is the covenant of Moses, as interpreted by the Qumran community, but it could refer to the Qumran community itself. Furthermore, the writer asserts that God in his mercy ‘uncovered the heart of dust to guard itself’ (21:9-10, DSSEL), among other things ‘from the traps of judgment’ (21:10). Perhaps this means that the writer is made aware of temptations that might involve apostasy or serious misconduct and thus can avoid them. The writer is aware of his fragility (21:11) but grateful to God that he ‘engraved eternity on the heart [of stone]’ (21:12-13), presumably his own.

The writer’s fragility is described as ‘a creature [of clay of du]st and a heart of stone’ (1QH^a 21:10-11). Newsom (2012:345) rightly notes that the background to this imagery is Genesis 2 (where the man is made from the dust of the earth). The heart of stone is somewhat reminiscent of Ezekiel 11:19 and parallel scriptures where the phrase is used of the stubborn human heart. Here in 1QH^a 21:11 the expression ‘heart of stone’ does, however, apparently not refer to a stubborn heart (which is covered elsewhere by the phrase *שִׁרְרוֹת לִבָּם*), but to the fact that the writer considers himself a mere mortal, since in line 9 he refers to the heart of dust, which appears to mean the same thing, and in 1QH^a 21:12-13 (DSSEL) he says that God had ‘engraved eternity on the heart of [stone].’ In fact, the expression ‘heart of stone’ in this passage is unique in the DSS, according to a word search in DSSEL. It is noteworthy that where the Hodayot refer to Ezekiel it is with regard to the spirit that God places within the writer, but not the new heart (cf. Newsom 2012:350). Also interesting is Newsom’s observation that the phrase *נָתַן רוּחַ בִּי* in the Hodayot refers to an individual, i.e. the writer, not, as in Ezekiel, to the community at large. Furthermore, unlike Ezekiel, who envisages something completely new and a removal of the previously unresponsive heart, ‘in the Hodayot the gift of the spirit from God does not result in the removal or eradication of the previously defective spirit in the speaker’ (Newsom 2012:350). On the contrary, the speaker is merely aware of his shortcomings, but resists the evil influences because he is enabled to do so by the spirit that God has placed within him (Newsom 2012:351).

After a lacuna the writer notes that God ‘ceased [] so as to bring him into covenant with Yourself and to establish [him before the judgment of the watchers?⁷⁰⁶]’ (DSSEL, 21:13-14). There is some disagreements among scholars as to how to reconstruct and translate the text here. DSSSE read ‘you *have made stop*, to bring into *the* covenant with you and so that *he will stand [in your presence]*’ (italics added); Schuller & Newsom (2012:65) read ‘you have *refrained* from bringing into covenant with you, or to *stand [... in the judgments of witnesses]*’ (italics added to indicate divergence from DSSEL). The reconstruction in Schuller & Newsom (2012:65) is based on the fragment 4QH^a 10:1-5 (according to their line numbering). DSSEL and DSSSE seem to take the statement positively, referring perhaps to the writer himself who has been brought into God’s covenant (presumably the Mosaic covenant as interpreted by the sectarian community) and enabled him to stand before God (DSSSE) or before the judgment of the watchers. Schuller and Newsom on the other hand seem to take it negatively, referring to some other people who have neither been allowed into God’s covenant nor made to stand in the judgment of witnesses (perhaps those of their own community). Due to the fragmentary nature of the text it is difficult to decide which of these readings is preferable. Though due to the context I slightly prefer the positive reading of either DSSEL or DSSSE, this is by no means certain, since some of the following readings are again divergent.⁷⁰⁷ Line 15 mentions ‘times of peace without bo[unds]’ (DSSEL), but the text is very fragmentary here and in the next two lines, so that it is difficult to establish the precise meaning.

What has been preserved of Column 22 starts by noting that there is holiness in heaven (1QH^a 22:1, Schuller & Newsom 2012:67, line 5 in their reckoning) or the heavenly abode (DSSEL). The next line points out a contrast to others, but the fragmentary nature of the text does not permit firm conclusions (1QH^a 22:2). The writer acknowledges his sinfulness (1QH^a 22:4) and a little later seems to point out that nonetheless he was able to guard himself (1QH^a 22:6) and receive knowledge from God (1QH^a 22:7). In lines 8-10 the writer apparently acknowledges again his fragile human nature, but also appears to state that through God he is strong and he knows that God’s words can be depended upon. He himself, he continues, has at his time taken hold of God’s covenant (1QH^a 22:10-11, DSSEL; [ואני בקצו אתמוכה בברי[תכה]], presumably the Mosaic covenant as interpreted by the sectarian community, and after another small lacuna the writer states that God has appointed him to the office he holds (1QH^a 22:11). The next few lines are again very

⁷⁰⁶ Reconstructing the lacuna לפני משפטים עירי; DSSSE read לפני, לפניכה, and leave the rest of the lacuna blank; Schuller & Newsom (2012:64) do not reconstruct לפני but leave the space blank, and read עירי instead of עירי, from 4QH^a 10:1-5.

⁷⁰⁷ For example, in the next part of the text, DSSEL reads ‘in the eternal abode, as a light of the *perfect light* (אורתום) forever,’ whereas Schuller & Newsom (2012:64-65) read ‘in the eternal dwelling for the *light of dawn* (אורתיים) forever.’

fragmentary and the content cannot be established with certainty. Once again the writer uses תמך (support, hold) instead of הזק (cf. 1QH^a 10:21 [see comments there], 4QHpap^f 7:2).⁷⁰⁸

3.4.2.15 1QH^a fr. 4:2-20 (=22:20-39)

The fragment 1QH^a 4:2-20 is inserted between columns 22 and 23 in DSSEL, but labelled 22:20-39 by Schuller & Newsom (2012:68-69). Only the middle parts of the lines in this fragment are preserved, and this makes any interpretation of the text extremely tentative. Only the text from line 7 [26]s onward makes some sense. Here the writer states that he ‘was established’ and that God opened his ears (1QH^a 4:7; cf. 15:10 above), a text that is reminiscent of Isaiah 50:4 (‘He awakens my ear to listen as a disciple;’ NASB). The rest of the line and the beginning of 1QH^a 4:8 (22:27) is missing. In the preserved part of this line the writer states that ‘the men of the covenant were deceived by them’ (אנושי ברית פוּתוּ בָּם; DSSEL⁷⁰⁹). Who the ‘them’ are, is not clear (perhaps the reference is to the Sons of Belial), and it is equally uncertain how they were deceived. In the next line the only words that make some sense is the statement that the writer feared God’s judgement (1QH^a 4:9 [22:28]) and in 1QH^a 4:10 (22:29) he asks how anyone can be ‘cleared of guilt’ in God’s judgment (Schuller & Newsom 2012:69). Though the phrase אנושי ברית appears elsewhere in the scrolls,⁷¹⁰ the present context is too fragmentary to pass any safe judgment concerning the meaning of the phrase. In 1QS 5:9 and 6:19 the expression occurs with a 3mp suffix and comes in connection with the priests [of Zadok] and ‘the men of their covenant’ (see comments above on these texts). Here in 1QH^a 4:8 (22:29) there appears to be no reference to priests or sons of Zadok. It seems, rather, that the phrase refers to the members of the writer’s community in general, who in one way or another fell for the deceptive teachings of the writer’s opponent(s) and thus were deceived. However, this is as much as can be said in view of the fragmentary nature of the text.

⁷⁰⁸ In the MT, the idea of holding fast to God’s covenant using הזק occurs only in Isaiah 56:4, 6 (a text usually considered late, post-exilic). There, Isaiah says that God will accept even those normally excluded from the covenant, i.e. eunuchs and non-Jews, who *hold fast* to his covenant. Otherwise people in the Bible are called to ‘cling to’ (דבק) God or ‘keep’ (שמר) his covenant.

⁷⁰⁹ Schuller & Newsom (2012:68-69) add some words at the beginning of the line ([] לוא יבוא כי [] ‘it will not enter, for’) which, however, do not enhance the general sense and understanding of the line.

⁷¹⁰ The expression occurs a total of 8 times: 1QS 5:9, 6:19; 1QS^a 1:2; 1Q36 7:2; 4QS^d 6 (3a-d):8; 4Q (4Q Shir^b) 511 63-64ii:5, 63-64iii:5, and our text. The phrase appears with 2mp suffix in 1QS 5:9, 6:19; 1QS^a 1:2, always in connection with priests; and without suffix in all other texts, always apparently referring to the members of the community in general.

3.4.2.16 1QH^a 23

In column 23:1-5 only the beginning of each line is preserved, with between one and three words clearly visible. From lines 6-11 (DSSEL) both the beginning and the end of each line is preserved, with more words visible in each line. The beginning of the column seems to reminisce about God's light (1QH^a 23:1-3). Line four picks up the idea of God opening the ear of dust from the previous two columns, but these are the only visible words in the line. In 1QH^a 23:5b-7 the writer notes that God has established/entrusted⁷¹¹ something in the ear of his servant, and apparently made his wonderful deeds known 'before the eyes of all that hear' (1QH^a 23:7) him. God himself guided 'all of them' by his 'mighty power' (Schuller & Newsom 2012:71, 1QH^a 23:8-9 = IV:7-8 DSSEL), and '[... he will praise your name and magnify himself in your glory' (23:9 = IV:8). Who the 'he' here refers to is uncertain, but it could be a reference to the writer himself. The next line asks that God not remove his hand (and perhaps something else – there is a lacuna in the text) so that 'he (presumably the writer) may become one who holds fast to your covenant' (1QH^a 23:10 = IV:9; [ל]היות לו מתחזק בבריתכה; []) 'and one who stands before you in [perfection]' (1QH^a 23:11 = IV:10). In other words, the writer asks for God's protection upon him so that he may be faithful to him. He continues to assert that God enabled him to speak appropriately (lit. 'according to the measuring line', 1QH^a 23:12 = IV:11) and instruct (presumably other) humans in God's judgments and regarding their sinful nature (1QH^a 23:12-14 = IV:11-13). Nevertheless, the writer experienced God's strength and was able to pass on whatever God taught him to others (1QH^a 23:14-16 = IV:13-15).

3.4.2.17 1QH^a 27

What is labelled 1QH^a 27:1-13 in DSSEL appears under column 26:26-38 in Schuller & Newsom (2012:78-79). Schuller and Newsom (2012:10) consider what they label 25:34-27:3 (?) one poem. The text is very fragmentary; in each line only the beginning is preserved, with about two to three words being preserved completely and one more partly. In both DSSEL and Schuller & Newsom (2012:78-79) the text has been largely reconstructed from cave 4 fragments. The following summary is based on this reconstruction. In this section, the word ברית appears for the last time in 1QH^a, at 27:7.

The fragment begins with the writer calling people to praise God for having performed wonders, bringing down the haughty and exalting the lowly (27:1-3). Furthermore, he states that God raises those who have fallen and they in turn will praise him for the great things he has done (27:3-6), so 'that they might know the *covenant* of

⁷¹¹ Established = DSSEL; entrusted = Schuller & Newsom (2012:71).

[His] mercies [and the magnitude of his mercies for all the children of His truth ...]’ (1QH^a 27:7, DSSEL, italics added; [... בדעת ברית חסדי]ו והמון רחמיו לכול בני אמתו ...). However, Schuller & Newsom, as well as DSSSE, instead of reading בדעת ברית חסדי]ו have בדעת ברוב חסדי]ו, i.e. ‘that they might know the *magnitude* of his mercies....’ The image of the fragment is smudged at the place where the last two letters of ברית or ברוב appear. However, though I am no expert and it seems at first sight that either reading could be correct, I believe that from what is visible of the letters, and comparing it with other letters ב and ה in the same line on the computer-enlarged image, the DSSEL reading is more likely. In other words, ‘covenant of [His] mercy’ (ברית חסד) may be accepted as the correct reading.⁷¹²

The expression ברית חסד is unique to the DSS, occurring only here and at 1QS 1:8 where the author states that the leader of the community ‘is to induct all who volunteer to live by the laws of God into the *Covenant of Mercy*, so as to be joined to God’s society and walk faultless before him, according to all that has been revealed for the times appointed them’ (1QS 1:7-9). At 1QH^a 27:7 the writer reiterates that those belonging to his community, whom he calls ‘children of [God’s] truth,’⁷¹³ may know his covenant of mercy by praising God for his wonderful deeds. In other words, they may be included in this exclusive fellowship. The covenant here is apparently the knowledge of God that can be attained by the strict adherence to the Mosaic law according to the sect’s interpretation and, by implication, through God’s revelation of this interpretation. As noted above on 1QS 1:8, the writer here also considers obedience to the law according to the strict interpretation of the sect a joy rather than a duty.

The writer continues, now in the first person plural (as opposed to 3ms or 3mp before – as if to confirm their belonging), to state that they as a community have known God as a ‘God of righteousness’ (אל הצדק) and that God has revealed himself to them and given them ‘insight’ (שכל) into his truth (27:7-8) and shown them his great power, as well as his compassion and the magnitude of his forgiveness (27:9). Compared to God’s

⁷¹² The parallel 4Q427 7ii:13 reads quite clearly ברוב חסדי]ו. This is probably why some scholars read 1QH^a 27:7 in the same manner, but 1QH^a 27:7 may well preserve a variant reading. If the reading ברוב חסד were accepted, there would be nothing to comment on the meaning of ברית in this context, though חסד is often associated with covenant contexts. The expression recalls such scriptures as Psalm 5:8 (וְאֲנִי בְרַב חַסְדֶּךָ אֶבְאֶה בֵּיתְךָ) ‘But as for me, by Your abundant lovingkindness I will enter Your house;’ NASB) or 69:14 (בְּרַב־חַסְדֶּךָ עֲנֵנִי בְּאֱמֶת יְשׁוּעָה) ‘in the greatness of Your lovingkindness, Answer me with Your saving truth;’ NASB), but in most cases the preposition used is כ (e.g. Is 63:7), and there is otherwise no similarity to the text in 1QH^a 27:7. If one includes the related adjective, the formula אֵל רַחוּם וְחַנּוּן אֶרְךָ אַפַּיִם וְרַב־חַסֵּד וְאֱמֶת (Ex 34:6; Ps 86:15; ‘gracious and compassionate God, longsuffering and abundant in mercy and faithfulness,’ my translation; cf. also Nu 14:18; Jl 2:13; Jon 4:2; Ps 103:8; Neh 9:17) comes to mind. In the context of Exodus 34:6, God appears to Moses on Mt Sinai, just before the covenant renewal after the incident of the golden calf (Neh 9:18ff also refer to the golden calf incident).

⁷¹³ Kim (2003:143) comments that this rather rare designation ‘appears to stand as a reference for the community itself.’

greatness, humanity is nothing (27:10), not even worthy to tell others of these great works of God (27:11). However, despite their unworthiness, God has nevertheless established the community (27:12), and evidently bestowed upon them his favour and given them the strength to hear about his great deeds (so according to Schuller & Newsom (2012:79), 26:38-39 in their reckoning). Here the text breaks off.

3.4.3 Concluding Remarks on בְּרִית in 1QH^a

This section considered the use of the term בְּרִית in the Hodayot. The context of each poem where the term occurs has been taken into account as far as possible. Hodayot uses the term בְּרִית in a variety of ways, but almost always in reference to a covenant between God and humans, in particular the Mosaic covenant as interpreted by the writer's community. As in the other scrolls examined, there are a number of unique (or almost unique) expressions, such as בְּרִית אָדָם at 1QH^a 4:27. I argued that it is more likely that the expression refers to a 'covenant of mankind' rather than 'covenant of Adam' and that in the context the phrase may refer to the ceremony that admits new members into the writer's community, though due to the fragmentary nature of the context this is of course not certain.

In 1QH^a 8:16 (cf. 4Q414 (4 Ritual of Purification A) 2ii, 3, 4:2) the expression בְּרִיתָּ בְּאֵמֶת occurs. In the context the importance of 'truth' or 'faithfulness' (אֵמֶת) is evident, and the phrase 'I hold fast to the truth of your covenant' implies both action (obedience) and attitude of heart, and 'truth of your covenant' may be better translated 'your reliable covenant.' It was also noted that at least in 1QH אֵמֶת may have the connotation of a body of teaching and factual truth, as well as reliability or faithfulness.

The reference to מְחֻקֵי בְּרִיתָּךְ ('from the statutes of your covenant') in 1QH^a 8:17 indicates that for the writer God's covenant implies not only privileges, but also regulations that need to be kept by the human covenant partner. The verb תִּמְךָ ('hold fast') instead of הִזָּק in 1QH^a 10:21-22 (cf. also 1QH^a 22:11) in connection with בְּרִיתָּ may have been chosen in analogy to the almost exclusive use of this word in the poetic texts of the MT. The assertion that the writer 'holds fast' to God's covenant is frequent in these poems (cf. e.g. 1QH^a 12:39; 23:10 using הִזָּק), and the phrase appears to refer to what the writer considered 'Scripture,' i.e. authoritative writings, which he is intent on following according to the strict interpretation of the sect (cf. also 1QH^a 18:29-30).

In an interesting turn of phrase the psalmist of Hodayot asserts that God has 'made his face shine with/through/by his covenant' (הֵאִירוּתָּהּ פָּנָי לְבְרִיתְכָּהּ, 1QH^a 12:5), a concept

that is reminiscent of Moses' face shining after he met with God on Mt Sinai. Later on in the same poem the writer mentions those who 'are meeting together for [God's] covenant' (1QH^a 12:24, הנועדים יחד לבריתכה), in a phrase where covenant refers not to the Mosaic covenant, but to the sectarian community. Holm-Nielsen (1960:84, n. 54) makes the attractive suggestion that the covenant initiation ceremony may be described here. Another peculiar expression is used a few lines later where the writer asserts that he has been 'forsaken by [God's] covenant' (1QH^a 12:35). I suggested that as in 12:24 the reference to covenant here is to the sectarian community.

The textual difficulties in 1QH^a 13:9 are not easy to solve, but I suggested that the reading following Wise (2003:125) with a slight emendation to וּמֵי הַבְּרִית ('and the waters of the covenant') seems to make the most sense in the context, though one cannot be dogmatic. The writer here uses the imagery of water to refer to [his own?] teaching (and that of his own community), i.e. his (their) interpretation of the Mosaic law.

The poem comprising 1QH^a 13:20-39 is an invective against the writer's enemies, which is expressed in quite vicious terms. The psalmist feels abandoned even by his close friends, whom he labels 'those who entered my covenant' (בְּאֵי בְרִיתִי; 1QH^a 13:23). The fact that the writer uses the pronoun 'my' may suggest that the author here is the founder of the community, though that is of course mere conjecture. There is also a striking allusion to Psalm 41:9 in this poem (1QH^a 13:23-24). Rather than seeing here a reference to a particular occasion and split in the sect, Newsom (2004:344) makes the plausible suggestion that the disaffection and grumbling against the leader that the poem addresses may have been an ongoing problem in the community meetings at various times.

In 1QH^a 15:8-10 the psalmist asserts that God had made him a 'tower of strength' (15:8) and a 'holy counsel to the weary' (15:10), and since he had been taught God's covenant, his 'tongue' has become like that of a disciple, a text reminiscent of Isaiah 50:4 (cf. also 1QH^a fr. 4:7 [DSSEL] = 22:26 [Schuller & Newsom 2012:68-69]). The writer's function as 'teacher' is evident here, and a little later on he is described as the 'father' of the community (1QH^a 15:19-21), again because of his thorough grounding in God's covenant (i.e. the Mosaic covenant as interpreted by the sectarians). This is expressed through another unique expression in 1QH^a 15:19-20, 'you caused me to stand (up?) for your covenant' (העמדתני לבריתכה). The context does not indicate any hostility against the author, so apparently here the idea is that the writer is firmly grounded in God's covenant (i.e. the Mosaic law as interpreted by the sectarians) and thus is able to teach his followers.

In one of the last poems considered the parallel clauses 'my heart rejoiced in your covenant' // 'your truth delighted my soul' (DSSEL; שש לבי בבריתכה ואמתכה תשעשע נפשי;

1QH^a 18:29-30) were encountered. Though שוש and ברית do not occur together in the MT, the idea of rejoicing in God's word does (e.g. Ps 119:14, 162 etc.). As in 1QH^a 8:17; 12:39, it appears that ברית in 1QH^a 18:29-30 refers to the whole body of authoritative 'scripture' (as conceived by the sect).

The one occurrence of the phrase אנושי ברית in 1QH^a fr. 4:8 (DSSEL; 22:27 in Schuller & Newsom 2012:68-69) comes in a very fragmented text, but it was noted that unlike in 1QS 5:9 and 6:19 there is no reference to priests and/or the sons of Zadok in the vicinity. The phrase in 1QH^a fr. 4:8 refers instead to the general membership of the writer's community.

The last occurrence of ברית in 1QH^a, at least according to DSSEL, appears in a very fragmentary text in column 27:7, in the phrase בדעת ברית חסדין ('that they might know the covenant of [His] mercies'). Not all commentators and translators accept the reading בדעת ברית חסדין, suggesting בדעת ברוב חסדין (i.e. 'that they might know the magnitude of his mercies...') instead, but I believe that the word ברית may be defended as the correct reading in the context. In this case, ברית חסד is yet another almost unique phrase that appears only in 1QH^a 27:7 and at 1QS 1:8. I suggested that the covenant in this context is the knowledge of God that can be attained by the strict adherence to the Mosaic law according to the sect's interpretation and, by implication, through God's revelation of this interpretation. In other words, as at 1QS 1:8, the writer considers obedience to the law according to the strict interpretation of the sect a joy rather than a duty.

3.5 Explanatory Notes on Selected Sections of the War Scroll (1QM) with Special Reference to Covenant Terminology

Of all the DSS under consideration, the War Scroll has the least occurrences of בריתה, namely thirteen (as compared to forty-one in CD; thirty-three in 1QS; and twenty-six in 1QH). The word first occurs in 1:2, and thereafter not again until 10:10. Apart from column 1, all other occurrences of the word are either in prayers or speeches of the priests (according to the outline provided by Schultz 2009:74-76). The significance of this will be discussed at the relevant places. Before looking at the text, however, a few introductory issues must be addressed.

3.5.1 The Unique Character, Genre, Unity and Date of the Scroll

3.5.1.1 Uniqueness and Genre

A number of scholars have pointed out the unique character of 1QM, since it is ‘the only work in Hebrew ancient or modern, dealing with the military art’ of a ‘highly organized and systematic war by Israel ... against all the nations of the world for the extermination of heathenism and the establishment of the Kingdom of God upon earth’ (Segal 1965:138; cf. also Schultz 2009:1, 10). The literary genre of the scroll is debated, perhaps because it combines several genres rather than fitting neatly into one particular one.⁷¹⁴ Parker (2012) for example finds eschatology (Parker 2012:56) and holy war traditions (Parker 2012:119), among others, but does not think that it is apocalyptic (Parker 2012:109). Van der Ploeg (1955:373) calls it a ‘Rule’ on the basis of the fact that the word סרך appears several times in the scroll. Duhaime (2004:53) concurs, saying that ‘the whole text, in its final shape, was probably intended as a rather coherent document, assembled according to accepted conventions and modelled after one of the genres available in the cultural environment of its redactor(s),’ and ‘probably belonged to the general category of ‘rule’ (*serek*).’ In an earlier study, Duhaime (1988) found some resemblance between the genre of 1QM and Greco-Roman Tactical Treatises. However, he is unsure ‘whether or not [the] War Scroll was intended for actual use by a group of priests in an authentic war. If so, it might be the only manual of that kind which has come down to us’ (Duhaime 1988:150). Indeed, war and religious ceremonies were always closely related in the ancient world (Duhaime 1988:150), but due to the apparent unreality of the document which is stressed by some

⁷¹⁴ Cf. García Martínez (2010b:317), who rightly observes that any attempt to fit the scroll into one particular genre fails to exhaust ‘the richness of the text in the way it has reached us.’ Consequently, ‘the best way to read the *War Scroll* is to integrate all these different readings’ (García Martínez 2010b:317).

commentators, he thinks that one might describe the War Scroll better as a ‘utopian tactical treatise’ (Duhaime 1988:151).

Davies (1990a:133) similarly thinks that 1QM is ‘idealistic and utopian’ in nature, and remarks that ‘fantasy is not necessarily an escape from reality.’ He contends that ‘in light of the antics of the terrorists who ended up on Masada, [1QM’s] contents may not have appeared so out of touch with reality’ after all (Davies 1988:150). Weitzman (2009:213) agrees with both Duhaime and Davies, but takes their observations further by including other ancient authors such as Caesar and Xenophon. He concludes, with Davies (1990a:133), that 1QM may have had a more practical relevance than generally assumed (Weitzman 2009:217). He believes that it may have served the purpose of encouraging and improving the morale of soldiers in combat by assuring them through speeches and rituals that God was on their side. In other words, the religious and liturgical instructions of the scroll were not designed as a liturgical drama (cf. Krieg 1985) or utopian literature, but served a real purpose (Weitzman 2009:217), namely to encourage soldiers during the war. Either the Maccabean or the Roman wars could be a likely background for the composition of the scroll, though Weitzman (2009:215, 238) believes the latter to be more likely.

Others suggest that 1QM is a kind of sectarian liturgy (Krieg 1985:11), apocalyptic literature (Duhaime 1984; cf. Duhaime 2004:54) or a war manual (Yadin 1962), though this latter perhaps falls under the broader category of ‘rule.’ This also seems to be the opinion of Treves (1958:419), as he notes that the contents of the scroll have ‘the appearance of a plan for a real war to be waged in the author’s days.’ Considering the many religious instructions in the scroll, however, it seems better to argue with Wise (1986:230) that the scroll is ‘essentially a theological, not a military composition,’ though it includes elements of rules as well as military instructions. It is composite, hence the variety of genres that appear in the scroll. Whether or not the writer had a real war (either past, present or future) in view is difficult to say, but on the whole I prefer the position that considers this scroll as pointing to an eschatological war.

3.5.1.2 *The Unity and Date of the Scroll*

Just as there is a debate about 1QM’s genre, the unity of the scroll is also disputed. Yadin (1962:ix) argues for a single author who made use of different sources, but other scholars deny this (e.g. Davies 1977:20-23). However, there does not seem to be a consensus about how exactly the scroll as we have it now received its form (Duhaime 2004:60). A number of scholars propose a history of compilation, with 1QM being the final edition. Eshel E and Eshel H (2000:351) for example note that discrepancies within the scroll point to ‘its

composite nature.’ They concur with Duhaime (1995:80) that 1QM is the final stage of the scroll’s literary development (Eshel E & Eshel H 2000:362-363), noting that 1QM is in fact a later revision of an original war scroll (Eshel E & Eshel H 2000:362). This final redactor ‘utilized the 4Q versions of the ... Scroll as well as other sources to create his new version’ (Eshel E & Eshel H 2000:362). Gmirkin (1998:205ff) suggests a five stage development of the scroll. He argues that a number of sections of columns 10-14 are probably pre-Maccabean, whereas the rest of these belong to the early Maccabean era (Gmirkin 1998:105). The third stage, columns 15-19, he dates to ‘late 164 BCE’ (Gmirkin 1998:206), just prior to the rededication of the Jerusalem Temple. Soon after the restoration of the Temple, he thinks, columns 2-9 were added (i.e. about December 164 BCE), and lastly column 1 was included ‘as an introduction to the final version of the War Scroll’ and probably to be dated in 163 BCE (Gmirkin 1998:207). Whether or not one accepts any of these reconstructions, I think García Martínez (2010b:316) is right to note that ‘in spite of its clearly composite character,’ the scroll ‘has a strong inner logic and emanates a powerful rhetoric and a clear message’: namely that the author and his community, i.e. ‘the good ones, the elect, the members of the new covenant, the sons of light, in spite of all difficulties will overcome all [their] enemies and will destroy the forces of evil, the wicked, the sons of darkness.’

Connected to the issue of unity is that of dating the scroll’s contents, already hinted at above in the discussion of Gmirkin’s view. The extant copy of 1QM is written in ‘formal early Herodian script’ and therefore can be dated ‘in the last part of the first century B.C.E.’ (Duhaime 1995:80).⁷¹⁵ The content of the scroll is, however, considered to be earlier. Yadin (1962:246), basing his conclusions on an analysis of the weaponry and other factors in the scroll, proposes a date ‘after the Roman conquest but before the end of Herod’s reign,’ i.e. in the second half of the first century BCE (see the table at Yadin 1962:245). A similar argument is given by Alexander (2003:29), who proposes that the content of the scroll, in particular the accurate and detailed description of the tactics in 1QM which is more suited to a Roman, rather than a Hasmonean or Greek background, best fits the historical scenario of 60-30 BCE. Laperrousaz (1986:276-277) also prefers a Roman date. He suggests that the scroll was written by the Teacher of Righteousness during his exile in Damascus between 67 and 63 BCE, though this seems to date the Teacher too late in my opinion.

⁷¹⁵ Duhaime (1995:81) observes that the oldest manuscript, 4Q493, dates to the first half of the first century BCE, but he also notes that ‘[n]o clear connection can be made between this manuscript and 1QM.’ 4QM496 is a poorly preserved manuscript, ‘written on the reverse side of a papyrus’ in a ‘pre-Herodian script’ which has been dated to ‘a few years before the middle of the first century B.C.E.’ (Duhaime 1995:81). The extant part of the scroll is quite similar to 1QM, though ‘not completely identical’ (Duhaime 1995:81). It appears to me that the date of this scroll would preclude a date for the content of 1QM after 50 BCE.

Other scholars use exactly the same data (i.e. weaponry and tactics) to argue for a Maccabean or Hasmonean dating rather than a Roman one. Already in 1952, before the whole scroll was published, Avi-Yonah (1952:5), basing his study on a summary by Sukenik (cf. Sukenik 1955:36), suggested that the ‘military reality behind the Messianic allegory’ of the scroll is reminiscent ‘of Maccabean warfare, embroidered by the author’s Messianic fancy and sectarian predilections.’ He thought that there are indications that one may pinpoint the scroll’s content to the time of Jonathan (Avi-Yonah 1952:5). Gmirkin (1998:208; see above) suggests that ‘the final version of the War Scroll appears to constitute the official war manual of the Maccabean army of 163 BCE,⁷¹⁶ while Treves proposes an equally precise date, 143 BCE, and furthermore opines that the scroll is non-sectarian since in his opinion it describes not a sectarian or eschatological war, but a national one (Treves 1958:422). He ascribes the scroll to a member of the Hasidim. Segal (1965:144-145) considers the scroll as ‘a product of a time of freedom and prosperity, such as prevailed in the reign of John Hyrcanus.’ Duhaim (1995:84) points out that some scholars argue for an early date for the War Scroll due to the fact that it ‘lacks important characteristics found in the bulk of Qumran literature.’ For example, though the term *yāḥad* is used seven times in 1QM, it never has the special sense of referring to a sectarian community as in 1QS, 1QH and CD, but indicates Israel as a whole.

If these issues are also taken into consideration, I would lean towards the earlier dating of the content of the scroll in the Maccabean or early Hasmonean era, though one cannot be dogmatic. While one may argue about the unity (or lack of it) of the scroll, it is the final document that has to be considered in the end. The following exploration concentrates on 1QM, which is the best preserved of all the war scroll documents. I will only refer to related documents where necessary.

3.5.2 The occurrences of פְּרִיַת in 1QM

3.5.2.1 1QM 1:1-2

The first column of 1QM, as noted above, has some lacunae in the first few lines. After (the remains of) a letter or two, the remainder of the first word(s) of lines 1-7 are missing. Scholars have proposed different reconstructions,⁷¹⁷ but all these suggestions end the first

⁷¹⁶ See also Gmirkin (2000:494-495).

⁷¹⁷ García Martínez & Tigchelaar (1997:112 [Hebrew] -113 [English]) reconstruct the beginning of 1QM 1 as follows: ‘For the Ins[tructor: The Rule of] the War’ (Hebrew: המלחמה [למ[שכיל סרך]), whereas DSSEL reads ‘For the Ins[tructor,] the War’ (Hebrew: המלחמה [למ[]]). Earlier, Van der Ploeg (1955:375) had suggested ‘[Voici la règle pour ordonner] la guerre’ (Hebrew: המלחמה [זה] [סרך לסדר]). This was taken up by Yadin (1962:256) who,

sentence after the word 'war' and begin another sentence with the following word, indicating that what precedes is considered a heading or title for the book. The rest of 1QM 1:1-7 summarises (the initial phase of) the war in which the Sons of Light attack and ultimately defeat the Sons of Darkness to the point of the latter's total annihilation (1QM 1:6-7).

It has been noted by many scholars that the first column of the War Scroll is particularly evocative of themes from the book of Daniel (e.g. Burrows 1956:206; Mertens 1971:79). Especially the first occurrence of the word ברית in 1QM 1:2 is in a context that is strongly reminiscent of Daniel 11:32 and in fact repeats verbatim the expression מרשיעי ברית which appears there. But before looking at this phrase in a little more detail, the context must be established.

The writer begins by telling his readers that the 'beginning of the sending of the hand⁷¹⁸ of the Sons of Light [will be] to fight against the Sons of darkness, against the army of Belial, against the band of Edom and Moab and the sons of Ammon and [] Philistia, and against the troops of the Kittim of Asshur and their people, with the help of the *violators of the covenant*, the sons of Levi, and the sons of Judah and the sons of Benjamin, the exiles of the wilderness will fight against them' (my translation). My translation is at this stage deliberately ambiguous, since from the Hebrew it is not quite clear which side the 'sons of Levi, and the sons of Judah and the sons of Benjamin' actually belong to. Most translators⁷¹⁹ consider them to be parts of the Sons of Light, as indicated for example by the full stop before this list of tribes in DSSEL where the list is appositional to the phrase 'those exiled to the wilderness': 'Supporting them are those who have violated the covenant. *The sons of Levi, the sons of Judah, and the sons of Benjamin, those exiled to the wilderness, shall fight against them*' (italics added). However, Eshel (2008:169) deviates from the majority position and suggests the following translation (which seems permissible from the Hebrew⁷²⁰):

For the Ma[skil (the instructor), Rule of] the war. The first attack of the Sons of Light shall be launched against the Sons of Darkness, the army of Belial, the troop of Edom and Moab, and the sons of Ammon 2 and the ar[my of the dwellers of] Philistia and the troops of the Kittim of Asshur, these being helped by those who violate the covenant, (*from*) *the sons of Levi, the*

however, proposed a slightly amended version: 'And th[is is the book of the disposition of] the war' (Hebrew: וז[ה] ה[ספר סודי] המלחמה).

⁷¹⁸ למ[] המלחמה ראשית משלוח יד בני אור להחל בגורל בני חושך בחיל בליעל בגדוד אדום ומואב ובני עמון משלוח יד; Beale (1984:45) says this phrase means 'conquest'; a similar phrase, משלוח יד, occurs a few times in Deuteronomy (12:7; 15:10 etc.), but never in a military context. The closest occurrence to 1QM 1:2 is Isaiah 11:14, the only biblical text where a military context, i.e. that of taking booty, is presumed.

⁷¹⁹ E.g. van der Ploeg (1955:375); Yadin (1962:256); Davies (1977:114); Duhaime (1995:97); DSSEL (see note 716 above).

⁷²⁰ Lines 1-2 in Hebrew read as follows (DSSEL):

1 למ[] המלחמה ראשית משלוח יד בני אור להחל בגורל בני חושך בחיל בליעל בגדוד אדום ומואב ובני עמון
2 וז[ה] פלשת ובגדודי כתיי אשור ועמהם בעזר מרשיעי ברית בני לוי ובני יהודה ובני בנימין גולת המדבר ילחמו בהם

sons of Judah, and the sons of Benjamin. The exiles of the wilderness shall fight against them (italics added).

In other words, in this interpretation the ‘sons of Levi’, ‘Judah’ and ‘Benjamin’ actually belong to the *enemies* of the Sons of Light, not their supporters; i.e. they are part of the ‘violators of the covenant’ (Eshel 2008:169, n. 23⁷²¹). Who is right? Are the ‘sons of Levi, the sons of Judah and the sons of Benjamin’ supporters (or part of) the Sons of Light, or are they their enemies?

Eshel (2008:169, n. 23) argues, based on his study of the ‘Prayer of Joseph’ (4Q372), that the sons of Levi, Judah and Benjamin are the enemies of the Sons of Light. 4Q372 1:13 mentions that these three tribes are being provoked by ‘words of deceit’ against ‘the tent of Zion.’ In Eshel’s opinion, this means that these three (southern) tribes returned from exile, but became the enemies of the Sons of Light and are not to be equated with them (Eshel 2008:169, n. 23). Screnock (2011:43) agrees with Eshel’s assessment that the three tribes are the southern tribes who returned from exile, that they are related to the temple, and that they were thus considered enemies of the Sons of Light and members of ‘those who violate the covenant.’⁷²² Unlike Eshel and others, however, he suggests that the phrase ‘the captivity of the wilderness’ is to be identified with the *enemies* of the sons of Light (see his translation below, note 722). His argument is mainly based on his assumption that the word order in the Hebrew of 1QM is primarily subject-verb (not verb-subject), ‘unless inversion is triggered by a fronted constituent or by an intransitive verb’ (Screnock 2011:44). However, the evidence can be understood differently.

It is of course correct that the reference to these three tribes in 1QM 1:2 ‘is unusual’ in the DSS (cf. Davies 1977:114). In fact, in the DSS they are only mentioned together a few times apart from 1QM: as noted above, in 4Q372 (without the appellation ‘sons of’); in 4Q385^a 18a-bii:7 (an apocryphal Jeremiah text⁷²³); and a few times in the Temple scroll where they are always referred to in a positive light (11Q19 24:11-12; 40:15-41:1; 11Q20 VI 10ii, 12:13-14). Schultz (2009:111) observes that the evidence of 1QM and 4Q372 is ambiguous and that both interpretations are possible unless other

⁷²¹ This is based on 4Q371/4Q372, probably 4Q372 1:14, which mentions the same three tribes in the same order. Eshel (2008:169, n. 23) refers to an article of his (in Hebrew, which unfortunately I am not able to understand), but does not give the precise reference in his book.

⁷²² Screnock (2011:43) translates 1QM 1:1-3 as follows:

‘The first sending of the hand of the Sons of Light is to begin with the lot of the Sons of Darkness, with the army of Belial, with the Troop of Edom and Moab and the sons of Ammon and the ar[my of those who dwell in] Philistia, and with the troops of the Kittim of Assyria – and with them, in their support, are those who violated the covenant, the sons of Levi and the sons of Judah and the sons of Benjamin, the captivity of the wilderness. Al[1 the sons of Darkness] will be engaged in battle with them, according to all their lots, when the captivity of the sons of Light returns.’

⁷²³ This reads in context (4Q385a (4QapocrJer C^a) 18a–b ii:5–7) :‘[And the word of the Lord came to] Jeremiah in the land of Tahpanes, which is in the land of E[gypt as follows, ‘Speak to] the Children of Israel and to the Children of Judah and Benjamin; [thus shall you say unto them]:’

corroborative evidence is found in favour of one or the other. He continues to argue that the Qumran sect used the term 'Judah' to refer to themselves (Schultz 2009:112), which would be a point in favour of the majority opinion. But, as Bergsma (2008) has shown, this is a debatable point. Bergsma (2008:187) does not agree that the Qumran sect used the term 'Judah' to refer to themselves, but argues that they preferred to call themselves 'Israel' or 'Israelites,' though he does note that the community was not 'anti-Judahite. On the contrary, the tribe of Judah has an honored place with the *Yahad*' (Bergsma 2008:187). Thus Schultz's argument concerning the Qumran sect's preferred reference to themselves as Judah is not as certain as he makes out. However, he is certainly correct to note that the Levites are highly esteemed in the DSS. Therefore he believes that 'it is clear that they are part of the Sons of Light' (Schultz 2009:113). In addition, the Levites are mentioned in a positive light in 1QM 5:1. This in my opinion turns the scale in favour of his position and against Eshel and Screnock. It is unlikely that the very people who are highly esteemed in one part of the scroll would in another be considered enemies. It would be different if 1QM 1:2 had a qualifying expression to show that only some members of these tribes were considered enemies. This, however, is not the case, despite Eshel's translation of 1QM 1:2: '... these being helped by those who violate the covenant, (*from*) the sons of Levi, the sons of Judah, and the sons of Benjamin' (Eshel 2008:169; italics added). There is no partitive preposition in the Hebrew, and Eshel (2008:169) acknowledges this by putting 'from' in parentheses.

Schultz (2009:121ff) continues to look at other evidence that supports his view, including the fact that 1QM 1 is dependent on Daniel 11-12. He concludes with the following observations regarding the nature of the Sons of Light (Schultz 2009:123): 'the author of M chose the unique expression ... "the sons of Levi and the sons of Judah and the sons of Benjamin," ... to describe those who will be involved in the opening battle of the eschatological war. Specifically, it meant those who have returned from exile.' However, some of these returnees 'will have aligned themselves with the enemy, these being the "violators of the covenant"' (Schultz 2009:123). He notes that the epithet 'sons of Levi, Judah and Benjamin could not be [used to designate] the sectarians only,' but

was purposely used to alert the reader to the kind of battle that was expected to kick off the 40-year eschatological war: ... launched by Daniel's King of the North ..., the king of the Kittim, and ... against all the Jews living in Judea who have not aligned themselves with him. While this included the sectarians, it was not limited to them only (Schultz 2009:123-124).

Another factor that may be significant in considering the list of Jewish tribes and their role in this context is the fact that the spiritual and secular leaders of the Jewish nation came from these same tribes: the Levites were religious leaders, from whom especially the priests came, but also lesser religious leaders who helped with the running of

the cult, whereas Judah and Benjamin supplied political leaders in the past history of Israel.⁷²⁴ The Maccabean leaders were also Levites, and this list of tribes may be a point in favour of considering the provenance of the content of the scroll (or at least col. I) in Maccabean times. Moreover, the Chronicler accepts only the southern kingdom as true Israel, whose descendants are the returned exiles at whom his work is directed. The sectarian community (at least those described in CD and 1QS) seems to have considered itself as the true Israel (an even narrower view than that of the Chronicler) and the true priesthood (cf. Krieg 1985:6), and it is therefore not impossible that this designation is used to make this fact clear. One may conclude, then, that the enemies of the Sons of Light in 1QM 1 consist of the ‘Sons of Darkness, the army of Belial,’⁷²⁵ [i.e.] ‘the troops of Edom, and Moab, and the sons of Ammon,’ the ‘Philistines, and the troops of the Kittim of Asshur,’ supported by the ‘violators of the covenant’ (my translation, but cf. DSSEL).

3.5.2.1.1 The Expression מרשיעי ברית in 1QM 1:2

Now the rare phrase מרשיעי ברית, literally ‘wicked ones of a covenant’ can be considered. It only occurs in 1QM 1:2 and in Daniel 11:32 where it describes those Jews who are deceived by the King of the North’s smooth words and thus fall away from their faith. It appears that in the present context too it refers to people who have fallen away from orthodox Jewish belief (according to the interpretation of the writer’s community) and instead have joined the enemies of the Jews.⁷²⁶ As far as the writer is concerned, they now

⁷²⁴ The first king of Israel was Saul, who belonged to the tribe of Benjamin. The Davidic kings all came from the tribe of Judah. In CD 8:4-6 the judges of the nation must consist of four Levites/Aaronites, plus six other Israelites ‘learned in the Book of Meditation and in the basic covenant principles’ (DSSEL). In fact, in CD the priests have foremost eminence, before Levites, other Israelites and proselytes (CD 14:5-6). But of course priests come from the tribe of Levi. Rost (1955:206) points to a connection with 1 Chronicles 12:25-28 which lists among others the tribes of Judah, Levi and Benjamin who brought warriors to David to consolidate his kingdom. He notes in particular the fact that the Levites in this context were not just the priestly tribe, but also provided a military contingent, just as in 1QM 1:2.

⁷²⁵ Belial apparently comes from a word meaning ‘worthlessness, wickedness’ (HALOT) and became in the NT a term for Satan (2 Cor 6:15; cf. Elwell & Comfort 2001:157). Hultgren suggests that the name was taken from Nahum 2:1 where ‘Belial is used of the anti-godly ruler of Nineveh’ (Hultgren 2007:354) and where God promises his people that ‘never again will the wicked one (Belial) pass through you’ (NASB). Hultgren continues to argue that it is only natural that ‘the author of the *Rule of War* will have taken Belial as the name of the leader of the hostile forces in the eschatological war, who will be destroyed on the “day of the LORD”’ (Hultgren 2007:355). This is all the more probable due to ‘the identification of Antiochus IV and the Seleucid kingdom with “Assyria” (1QM I,2, 6)’ (Hultgren 2007:355). The fact that in the DSS this name was identified with a supernatural figure may be based on Psalm 18:5 (von der Osten-Sacken 1969:76) where ‘Belial’ apparently refers to a god of the underworld (Hultgren 2007:355-356), as well as on the figure of Melchiresha who appears in the Aramaic sacerdotal texts. The curses pronounced on this figure are sometimes identical with those pronounced on Belial, and therefore Hultgren (2007:356) suggests that ‘Belial and Melchiresha came to be identified with each other.’ Ultimately, Hultgren (2007:357) rightly concludes that the ‘figure of Belial as the angel of darkness ... has its roots in the confluence of traditions ... [found] in the *Rule of War*.’

⁷²⁶ Van der Ploeg (1955:394) says ‘it is the Jews who are allied with the oppressors of their people, either through complacency or fear, and thus neglect their duties to the Law’ (‘ce sont les Juifs qui se sont alliés aux oppresseurs de leur peuple, soit par complaisance, soit par peur, et qui négligent ainsi leurs devoirs envers la Loi’). Mertens (1971:79) observes that just as in Daniel the expression refers to Hellenistic Jews who denied the faith of their

support the ‘Sons of Belial,’ including (or comprising) the ‘band of Edom and Moab, and the sons of Ammon’ (1QM 1:1) as well as the Philistines, all considered arch-enemies of Israel. Gmirkin (1998:191) suggests that the ‘violators of the covenant’ are ‘the renegade Jews of the Acra who posed a constant military threat to the Jews of the upper city,’ but this seems too specific in the context (Schultz 2009:127 is also critical of this suggestion).

‘Edom, Moab and the sons of Ammon’⁷²⁷ are also mentioned in this order in Daniel 11:41, though there they are not among the attackers of Israel, but among those who will not be overrun by the King of the North, perhaps precisely because they are on the side of the enemy (Schultz 2009:99; cf. von der Osten-Sacken 1969:32). In addition, the writer mentions among the enemies of the Sons of Light the ‘Kittim of Asshur,’ an enigmatic designation that will be considered below. Similar lists of enemies can be found in 2 Kings 24:2 (where, however Aram is listed instead of Edom; this text also mentions the word ‘bands’, קַיִטִּים), Isaiah 11:14, Daniel 11:41 and Psalm 83:6-8, but none of these texts are exactly the same as 1QM 1:2 (cf. Vanonen 2011:229-230). Vanonen (2011:230) suggests that the author of 1QM 1 probably did not list these names ‘following a specific source text,’ but rather agrees with Wenthe (1998:296), who rightly notes that by describing the enemies of the sons of Light in this way, ‘1QM opens with a stylized presentation of the community’s opponents.’ Vanonen (2011:230) thinks, however, that Daniel 11 probably was most influential due to the other connections with this book in 1QM 1. Wenthe (1998:296) believes there may have been a possible dependence on Psalm 83:6-8, though he goes on to note that the writer of 1QM may equally well have decided ‘to move from the traditional and geographically close enemy (Edom, Moab, Philistia) to the foreign enemy (whether Greek or Roman), and then to the traitors from within.’ In other words, the list of enemies listed is not a quotation or allusion to a particular text, but is informed from a number of scriptural allusions.

3.5.2.1.2 Excursus: Who are the ‘Kittim of Asshur’?

The expression ‘Kittim of Asshur’ is unique in the DSS and does not occur in the Bible, though of course both ‘Kittim’ and ‘Asshur’ appear, the latter quite frequently in the course of the retelling of the history of the Israelites as they encountered the Assyrians. The ‘Kittim’ are mentioned only six times in the MT. The first of these occurrences is at Genesis 10:4 (see also 1 Chr 1:7) where they are mentioned in the genealogy of Javan.

ancestors and instead allied themselves with Antiochus. He suggests that there must have been a similar movement of apostasy in the history of the Qumran sect which greatly influenced it.

⁷²⁷ In the majority of occurrences of the word Ammon in the HB the phrase ‘sons of Ammon’ is used, but in Psalm 83:8 only ‘Ammon’ appears.

Incidentally, Assyria is mentioned a few verses further on (Gn 10:11), in connection with Nimrod's travels (1 Chr 1 does not mention Assyria in this context, though it refers to Nimrod). The second occurrence of 'Kittim' is in Numbers 24:24, in the prophecy of Balaam where he prophesies that 'ships *shall come* from the coast of Kittim, And they shall afflict Asshur and will afflict Eber; So they also *will come* to destruction' (NASB). Here both the Kittim and Asshur are mentioned in the same verse, though not in the same way as in 1QM 1. The Kittim appear twice in Isaiah 23, in a prophecy against Tyre. Both in verse 1 and 12 the word is translated 'Cyprus' by the NASB, and significantly Asshur (translated 'Assyria' by NASB) appears again in close vicinity in verse 13 (cf. Yadin 1962:25, who also observes this fact). The last and most significant occurrence is in Daniel 11:30, since 1QM is reminiscent of this chapter.⁷²⁸ Here we read, possibly in analogy to Numbers 24:24, but perhaps more likely referring to Isaiah 23:12-13,⁷²⁹ that 'ships of Kittim will come against him [i.e. the King of the North]; therefore he will be disheartened and will return and become enraged at the holy covenant and take action; so he will come back and show regard for those who forsake the holy covenant' (Dn 11:30, NASB). It seems from the biblical evidence, that 'Kittim' are people coming from the coastal regions or islands west of Israel and thus could refer to either Greeks or Romans (in Gn 10 probably the Greeks, in Dn 11 the Romans), whereas Asshur was the enemy usually expected from the north. The question that arises is therefore to whom the expression 'Kittim of Asshur' refers in 1QM 1:2.

Yadin (1962:25) suggests that the expression is probably used because several times in the Bible both 'Kittim' and 'Asshur' appear in close proximity to each other (Nu 24:24; Is 23:12-13; Ezk 27:6). He notes that this obviously indicates that 'these Kittim ... had their dwelling place or centre to the north of Palestine,' and that the ultimate defeat of the Kittim in 1QM 19 is 'compared to the destruction of Sennacherib's troops near Jerusalem' (Yadin 1962:25; cf. Is 37:36). He further asserts that by identifying the enemy of the day by the title 'Kittim of Asshur,' the author, imitating the style of the Pesharim, used scriptures describing the Assyrian defeat and applied them to his own situation (Yadin 1962:25-26; see also note 4 on p. 24). As noted above, Yadin dates the contents of 1QM to Roman times, and hence in his opinion the enemy of the day was the Romans (Yadin 1962:243-246).

⁷²⁸ For a list of verbal correspondences cf. for example Flusser (2007:143); Wenthe (1998:297-298); Carmignac (1956:240; he notes other references too). See also Vanonen (2011).

⁷²⁹ Schultz (2007:73-75 and 2009:127-158) argues convincingly that Daniel did not base his prophecy on Numbers 24:24, but used the term 'Kittim' in a geo-political sense, even in an eschatological context.

A completely different interpretation is proposed by Atkinson (1957-58). He stands out, and alone, it appears, with his opinion that in 1QM 1 the ‘Kittim of Egypt’ (as he interprets the beginning of line 4) are not another enemy of the Sons of Light, but in fact their supporters, and opines that “‘Kittim’ ... is evidently a term which will apply equally to enemies and to friends’ (Atkinson 1957-58:276). This is in my opinion untenable, since all other references to the ‘Kittim’ in 1QM are to an enemy of the first rank. In fact, Atkinson seems to misinterpret 1QM 1:4, since after a lacuna at the beginning of the line the first visible words are *הכתיים במצרים*, i.e. ‘... the Kittim in’ or ‘into Egypt’ (cf. DSSSEL, DSSSE, Duhaime 1995:97). While lines 4-5 seem to refer to a war between Egypt and the ‘kings of the North,’ which is interpreted as a time of salvation for the people of God, it is in my opinion unwarranted to consider the two words as being connected in such a way that the Kittim in this line (uniquely in 1QM) refer to friends of the Sons of Light.

Flusser (2007:155) restores the lacunae in lines 4-5a in such a way that together with the end of line 3 the text could read: ‘And after the war, they shall go up from there. [And the king] of the Kittim [will come to] Egypt. And in his time, he will go out with great rage to wage war against the kings of the North, and in his anger he wants to exterminate and cut off the horn of Israel⁷³⁰....’ Of course, this is mere conjecture and unfortunately cannot be proven, but in the context it makes more sense than Atkinson’s suggestion. Vanonen (2011:234-235) supports Flusser’s reconstruction, observing that (a) it fits the context both grammatically and lexically; (b) in the context of the whole scroll it is at least possible that there may be a reference to the *king* of the Kittim; and (c) it also fits in with the dependence of 1QM 1 on Daniel 11 where ‘the one who will destroy and the one who will fall are the same, (the king of the Kittim of) Asshur’ (Vanonen 2011:235).⁷³¹

Gazov-Ginzberg (1965:176) does not comment on the expression ‘Kittim of Asshur,’ but suggests that the term ‘Kittim’ in 1QM does not necessarily refer to a particular enemy, but is ‘a pseudonym ... for the future main enemy, either the Romans or any new power.’ The ‘Kittim of Asshur’ in this case could then be a synonym for an enemy based in Asia (as implied by Gazov-Ginzberg 1965:176).⁷³² Rowley (1956:96),

⁷³⁰ ‘Israel’ is restored from an initial, barely visible, yod before the lacuna; cf. DSSSE.

⁷³¹ Schultz (2009:90-91) argues for this reconstruction on the basis of 4Q496, but since this fragment is ‘very small and corrupted and the decisive word Israel is very weakly visible,’ and since the fragment has been reconstructed from 1QM 1 (Vanonen 2011:236), this is a circular argument. Hence, other evidence should be provided.

⁷³² Batsch (2010:171-172) argues that the War Scroll circulated for about 150 years during which the political landscape changed several times, and ‘during which many wars occurred’ (Batsch 2010:171). He ingeniously suggests that 1QM 1 reflects three different wars: lines 1-3a in his opinion ‘has much to do with the actual wars of the Maccabean-Hasmonean dynasty’ (Batsch 2010:171); lines 3b-7 he attributes to the ‘three last Syrian conflicts between Lagids and Seleucids’ (Batsch 2010:172), and 1QM 1:9b-14 for him describes a future, eschatological war. His point is that since the warring factions differed, so did the description of the enemy. ‘This is why the Kittim could be *simultaneously* ... the Greeks, the Romans, and probably, another metaphor for Amalek and all other

thinking that the Teacher of Righteousness lived before the Romans arrived in Palestine, argues that the term ‘Kittim’ refers to the Seleucids, not the Romans, contra e.g. Dupont-Sommer (1953, *Aperçus Préliminaire*,⁷³³ cited by Rowley 1956:95ff) or Yadin (1962:24).⁷³⁴

A more detailed and nuanced argument for the identification of the Kittim with the Seleucids is given by Schultz (2007; 2009:127-168). He observes that outside the Qumran literature, ‘the Kittim always come from the western Mediterranean world and not Asia,’ and clash with Assyria when both they and Assyria are mentioned together (Schultz 2007:63). The term, he says, was not used with eschatological connotations, but simply was a geo-political description (Schultz 2009:157) or even just referred to (foreign) warriors (Schultz 2009:146; cf. Jub 37:10, ‘mighty men of war’). Schultz (2007:63) tries to show that ‘the Qumranites were the first to consider *Num* 24:24 as foundational in their understanding of the immediate *eschaton*.’ In other words, they reinterpreted Numbers 24:24 and Daniel’s unfulfilled prophecy of the end of the King of the North (11:40-45), and thus were able to use the term ‘Kittim’ in the sense of both these scriptures ‘as harbinger[s] of the eschatological age’ (Schultz 2007:77; 2009:153). Schultz (2009:158) concludes his discussion by observing that in 1QM ‘the [lot of the] Sons of Darkness were a coalition of enemies collated ... from Dan 11 and complemented with Isa 11:14.⁷³⁵ ... the head of this coalition was Daniel’s ultimate eschatological foe, the “King of the North,” renamed “king of the Kittim.”’ Schultz (2009:158) further argues that 1QM, realizing that Daniel’s prediction of the demise of the ‘King of the North’ had not come to pass, reinterpreted Daniel’s prophecy of 11:40-45, and in Schultz’s opinion this was the major factor in the author’s choice of names for the enemies in 1QM 1-2, mainly to show that these verses could yet find fulfilment.

As is obvious from this discussion, one cannot be dogmatic about who in fact is meant by the expression ‘Kittim of Assyria.’ Burrow’s suggestion that it is ‘a cryptic reference to some power of the writer’s own time,’ without necessarily fixing one’s attention on a particular political power in question still has a lot to commend it (Burrows

enemies of Israel; this is also why we can find, *simultaneously*, ancient ... and modern weaponry in the same text’ (Batsch 2010:172; italics his).

⁷³³ Unfortunately I was unable to get hold of this work, but he makes the same point in his book *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (Dupont-Sommer 1962:168).

⁷³⁴ Though in his more nuanced treatment Yadin (1962:23-26, esp. pp. 25-26) concludes that ‘the author’s identification of the Kittim as ‘Kittim of Asshur’ was made in order to enable him to “interpret”, in the manner of the Pesharim, passages about the Assyrian defeat as applying to the Kittim.’

⁷³⁵ This is augmented by the fact that in this verse alone in the MT the phrase מְשַׁלְּחֵם אֶת יָדָם appears, lit. ‘the outstretching of their hand,’ here referring to Edom and Moab, followed by the remark that ‘the sons of Ammon (will be) their subjects.’

1956:205). Mertens (1971:62-63) similarly states that at Qumran ‘the Kittim are the enemies of the people of God as such, especially in the eschatological war.’⁷³⁶

3.5.2.2 1QM 1:3-end

The war described in 1QM 1:1-7 will take place ‘when the exiles of the Sons of Light return from the wilderness of the peoples to camp in the wilderness of Jerusalem’ (1QM 1:3, DSSEL). Again there is some ambiguity: what is meant by the ‘wilderness of the peoples,’ and what is meant by the expression ‘to camp in the wilderness of Jerusalem’? The phrase ‘wilderness of the peoples’ occurs only once more in the DSS, in 4Q161 (4QpIs^a) 2-6:18, and even there the word ‘peoples’ is only partly preserved. Schultz (2009:159, n. 245) points out that due to the poor preservation of this text it is impossible to gain any insights into the meaning of the phrase from this document.⁷³⁷ Davies (1977:115) suggests that the phrase ‘is taken from Ezekiel xx, 35 where it denotes Babylon.’ This, incidentally, is the only occurrence of the phrase in the OT. Davies continues to note that if in 1QM 1:3 the phrase also refers to Babylon, it would indicate that ‘the Final War would commence when other members of the sect returned from Babylon to join their fellows,’ and that in this case the phrase ‘wilderness of Jerusalem’ would refer either in an approximate geographical sense to Qumran or perhaps metaphorically ‘to the religious wilderness of the Jerusalem Temple, as it was seen by the sect’ (Davies 1977:115). Van der Ploeg (1955:394) suggests that the term refers to the faithful in analogy to 1QS 8:13, the relevant part of which reads: ‘they shall ... go to the wilderness, there to prepare the way of truth/the Lord’ (DSSEL). Gmirkin (1998:192) proposes the Hasidim in general as the referent for the phrase ‘exiles of the wilderness of the nations.’ He believes that the ‘return’ from this ‘wilderness of the nations’ ‘may refer to the ... rescue of Jews from Transjordan in late spring 163,’ and that the ‘wilderness of Jerusalem’ is probably located in the part of Judah that lies east of the city (Gmirkin 1998:192).

Yadin (1962:257) notes that the phrase ‘wilderness of Jerusalem’ occurs neither in the OT nor in the Rabbinic literature, but suggests a possible connection to Isaiah 52:9, which refers to the ‘waste places of Jerusalem’ (תְּרֵבוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַיִם). Generally, one may note

⁷³⁶ ‘Hier sind die Kittim die Feinde des Gottesvolkes schlechthin, vor allem im eschatologischen Krieg.’

⁷³⁷ The relevant section of 4Q161 is a Peshier on Isaiah 10:22-11:4 which describes Assyria’s attack on Israel, but tells the people they must not be afraid, since God will strike the Assyrians and deliver Jerusalem (10:22-34). Isaiah 11:1-4 contains the prophecy about the ‘shoot of Jesse’ on whom God’s spirit will rest and who will be everything Jerusalem’s leaders in Isaiah’s day were not. Schultz (2009:160) suggests that 4Q161 is dependent on 1QM and borrowed the phrase ‘wilderness of the peoples’ from this text. The Peshier is a messianic interpretation of the Isaiah passage, and like the War Scroll ‘deals with the eschatological war against the Kittim’ (Schultz 2009:160).

that *מדבר* in the HB is an ambivalent term that may refer to a place of aridness and lack of resources which can be associated with rebellion and defection, punishment and death on the one hand, but which may also be a place of healing and purification where God meets with his people in a special way and reveals himself to them (Ryken, Wilhoit & Longman 1998:948-951, esp. p. 951; Najman 2006, esp. p. 100). If the term ‘wilderness of the peoples’ is associated with exile (or the diaspora, cf. Burrows 1956:201), so is perhaps also the phrase ‘wilderness of Jerusalem,’ especially since both are used in one breath. Schultz (2009:164) suggests that though 1QM 1:3 indicates ‘some kind of return ... there is also an emphasis on their being in the wilderness,’ i.e. in exile, ‘even if the “wilderness” in question changes.’ In other words, ‘the condition of being in exile’ has nothing to do with location: it can happen both inside and outside the promised land (Schultz 2009:164). Schultz (2009:164) significantly goes on to note that therefore ““exile” in M is not a denial of the return to the land, but rather a description of some spiritual reality.’ This ties in with Daniel 9 where the exile that Jeremiah predicted as 70 years, is reinterpreted to indicate 70 Sabbath years, i.e. 490 years. Najman (2006:104) suggests that ‘wilderness’ may refer to the state of being absent from the temple. If 1QM comes from the Maccabean period when the temple was desecrated, or even later in the history of the sect, when the members considered the worship in Jerusalem to be false and from which they deliberately separated themselves, this notion is entirely understandable. Despite the return from foreign exile, the sect still feels (spiritually) exiled in their own homeland. It is this connotation that seems to be foremost in the mind of the writer of 1QM 1:3.⁷³⁸ He ends this section by noting that ‘after the war/battle, they shall go up from there []’ (1QM 1:3). Unfortunately, there is a lacuna at the beginning of line 4 which may or may not have indicated a precise place, but the verb *עלה* possibly indicates the direction of Jerusalem.

The remainder of 1QM 1:4-7 contains a description of the overthrow of the Kittim. Flusser (2007:147) restores the lacunae at the beginning of lines 4 and 5 by considering 1QM’s dependence on Daniel 11,⁷³⁹ and proposes the following reading for lines 4-5a: ‘[Then came the king] of the Kittim ... [into] Egypt. And in this time, he will go out with great rage to war against the kings of the North, and in his anger wants to exterminate and cut off the horn of [Israel].’ However, Yadin (1962:258) suggests the restoration [Belial]

⁷³⁸ In the New Testament the theme is taken up in the concept of Christians being pilgrims in a foreign land, whose home is not an earthly place but the heavenly kingdom (e.g. Hbr 11:13 where the NASB actually uses the word ‘exiles’; 1 Pt 2:11).

⁷³⁹ Cf. Mertens (1971:79-80), who also points out this similarity to Daniel 11:44. In Daniel 11:44, we are told that the King of the North will be disturbed by rumours from the east and north, and consequently will ‘go forth with great wrath to annihilate many’ (NASB; *וַיֵּצֵא בְחֵמָה גְדוּלָה לְהַשְׂמִיד וְלְהַכְרִים רַבִּים*). In 1QM 1:4 too someone (Mertens 1971:79-80 thinks it is God) goes out ‘in great wrath to war against the kings of the North and in his anger to annihilate and to cut off the horn of...’ (*יֵצֵא בְחֵמָה גְדוּלָה לְהַלָּחֵם בַּמְלָכִי הַצָּפוֹן וְאָפוּ לְהַשְׂמִיד וְלְהַכְרִית אֶת קַרְן*). Mertens (1971:80), however, unlike Flusser, suggests that the ‘horn’ that is cut off is the ‘horn of Belial,’ which he suggests is reminiscent of Daniel 7:20-25 and 8:9-12.

instead of [Israel], whereas Davies (1977:116) restores lines 4-5 to suggest that God destroys the horn. Certainty is of course impossible, but it appears that more recent commentators prefer Flusser's interpretation (cf. Vanonen 2011:231-236; Schultz 2009:91-95), though it is not without its problems. It is beyond the scope of the present study to go deeper into the pros and cons of this argument. The rest of line 5 notes that this will be 'a time of salvation for the People of God, and a time of dominion for all the men of his forces, and eternal annihilation for all the forces of Belial' (DSSEL). 1QM 1:5 ends with the words, 'there will be panic' (generally modified to 'great panic' if the beginning of line 6 is restored as 'great'), probably 'among' the sons of Japhet (Heshel 2008:170). The text then states that 'Asshur will fall and there will be no help for him, and the dominion of the Kittim shall cease, so that wickedness shall be subdued, without a remnant, and there shall be no escape for the S[ons] of Darkness' (1QM 1:6-7, my translation). This reference to 'no escape' is again reminiscent of the book of Daniel, this time 11:42 where it is stated that 'the land of Egypt will not escape' the onslaught of the King of the North.

Mertens (1971:80) believes that the similarities between Daniel 11 and 1QM 1 are merely superficial; the point of contact is not in the historical allusions but in the fact that neither Egypt nor the sons of Darkness will *escape*:

Es geht also nicht an, einen inhaltlichen Zusammenhang zwischen beiden Stellen zu suchen, als habe der Verfasser von 1QM 1 den Heiligen Krieg in der Art der Dan 11,40-45 aufgezeichneten Auseinandersetzungen beschrieben. Der Zusammenhang ist viel äußerlicher: in beiden Stellen findet sich teilweise die gleiche Terminologie, sie wird jedoch von den beiden Verfassern in verschiedener Weise verwendet (Mertens 1971:80).

A little later, Mertens (1971:81-82) remarks that apart from certain linguistic and lexical correspondences, 1QM 1 and Daniel 11:40-12:3 also exhibit a number of similarities in content. Both texts are set during a war at the end of times, in both the forces of good experience great tribulation, and in both texts the final outcome is a total defeat of evil forces and the victory of the righteous. Obviously these ideas are not unique to Daniel and 1QM, since they are found in other apocalyptic and sectarian literature, but these similarities show that the two texts at least draw on common concepts.

The second section of 1QM 1 describes this final war further and in more detail. It starts by looking at the role of the Sons of Light, with 1QM 1:8 being reminiscent of Daniel 12:3, though possibly not looking to the eschatological future as Daniel does, and certainly not implying resurrection. The Sons of Light, now termed Sons of Righteousness, will 'shine to all the ends of the world, continuing to shine until the appointed times of darkness are completed' (1QM 1:8; my translation, but cf. DSSEL). Moreover, 'at the appointed time of God, the greatness of his excellence will shine to all the ends/for all the times of [] for peace and blessing, glory and joy, and length of days for all the Sons of

Light' (1QM 1:8-9a; my translation, but cf. DSSEL). This 'appointed time of God,' while a day of glory for the Sons of Light (at least to some extent, since later, in 1QM 1:12, we are told that it will also be a time of great distress for 'all the people who are redeemed by God,' cf. Dn 12:1), will be a day (or perhaps better a time⁷⁴⁰) of destruction for all those not belonging to their ranks. Lines 9bff describe this destruction in detail as a 'great carnage' (בְּחַשְׁרֵי חֶזֶק), 1QM 1:9) which is fought in seven battles in which the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness seem to be equally matched since each will win three times. In the last battle, however, God will intervene personally and thus the victory of the Sons of Light is assured. All this draws upon concepts and traditions from Daniel, the 'Day of the Lord,' and the 'holy war' (cf. Hultgren 2007:354), which make up 'the fundamental conception of the eschatological war' (Hultgren 2007:354) and are then elaborated in the rest of the scroll.

3.5.2.3 1QM 10

In 1QM 2-9 the word בְּרִיית, which is the focus of this study, does not occur. In column 2, after describing the duties and divisions of the priests and high priest, the writer explains how the remaining thirty three years of the forty year war are to be fought. It will be 'a war of divisions' (1QM 2:10), to be fought only in non-sabbatical years (i.e. for twenty-nine years). It will be a war against the whole world, and each year or few years a different enemy is to be conquered (the list of nations given is reminiscent of Gn 10⁷⁴¹). Column 3 begins with a description of the trumpets to be used during these war years (1QM 3:1-11). The section from 1QM 3:12 to the end of 1QM 4 explains the design and use of banners. 1QM 5:3-14 describes the army (infantry) and its weapons. From 1QM 5:16-6:6 the course of the battle/war is explained. 1QM 6:8ff describes the cavalry's equipment and weaponry as well as their role in battle. In column 7 we find rules for the army, such as the age of combatants and their qualifications, and 7:9ff is devoted to war tactics, including the role of the priests, which is of the utmost importance for the writer. This description continues through columns 8 and 9.

⁷⁴⁰ There is some discussion about the issue of time reference in 1QM. Apparently, 1QM 1:1-7 envisages a war that is happening during one day, while the rest of the scroll looks at a war lasting 40 years. 1QM 1:1-7 seems to describe one battle, whereas later in the same column there are seven battles. I am not so sure that one needs to distinguish the two parts so strictly. The 'day of judgment' is a concept known from the Bible, and it is my belief that it does not refer to a literal 24 hour day, but describes a time of judgment of indefinite length. Similarly, the word translated 'battle' is the same as that for 'war.' A war generally has a number of different battles, and perhaps the first seven lines give a general summary of this war, while the remainder gives the details of different battles. Schultz (2009:237) suggests that 1QM describes the eschatological war in two stages, with column 1 looking at its beginning, and column 2 at its end. A similar two-stage war is anticipated in Micah 5:4-7 and 4QFlorilegium (Schultz 2009:237).

⁷⁴¹ García Martínez (2010b:311, n. 32) observes that 'the author/redactor of 1QM seems to depend more directly on the interpretations of this table' in Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon, 'since 1QM follows their order and not the one of Genesis' (cf. Jub 7-9; 1QapGn ar 16-17). For a more detailed interpretation of the tables of the nations in Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon and comparison with Genesis 10 see for example Eshel (2007:109-132) and Machiela (2009, esp. pp. 85-135).

Moses said), more precisely Numbers 10:9 (which is quoted almost verbatim), to encourage the people, this time when they encounter war in their own territory. Then they must ‘sound [the] alarm with trumpets’ so as to be remembered before God (1QM 10:6b-8a; cf. Nu 10:10).

The following section (1QM 10:8b-16) is a prayer directed to God. Davies (1977:95) calls it a creation hymn, which has in his opinion ‘nothing to do with war’ (Davies 1977:96). The hymn praises God by noting that nothing can compare to him, either in heaven or on earth, because no one else can do such ‘great works’ and exhibit such ‘great strength’ (1QM 10:8-9: *מא כמוכה אל ישראל בש[מי]ם ובארץ אשר יעשה כמעשיכה (הגדולים וכגבורתכה החזקה)*).⁷⁴⁷ Neither can anyone compare with God’s own people Israel, ‘whom you have chosen for yourself from all the peoples of the lands, (the) people of (the) holy ones of (the) covenant, taught/learned in the statute(s), the wise/insightful of understand[ing]’ (my translation, 1QM 10:9-10; *מיא כעמכה ישראל אשר בחרתה לכה מכול עמי* [*הארצות עם קדושי ברית ומלומדי חוק משכילי בינ[ה]*]⁷⁴⁸ Yadin (1962:304, 306) translates: ‘who is like unto Thy people Israel, which Thou hast chosen for Thyself from all the nations of the lands, a people of men holy through the covenant, taught the statutes, enlightened in un[derstanding ...].’

The exact phrase ‘people of the holy ones/saints’⁷⁴⁹ of the covenant’ in 1QM 10:9-10 does not occur in the MT. Perhaps it is used here deliberately to indicate that humans are meant, not angels, since angels also may be simply referred to as קדושים. Van der Ploeg (1955:410) points out that the expression combines words found in Daniel 9:24 and 11:30, but he does not detail which ones.⁷⁵⁰ However, in Daniel 9:24 the word ברית is not found, and in fact the verse is in my opinion not at all reminiscent of 1QM 10:9-10.⁷⁵¹ In Daniel 11:30 (and also Dn 11:28) reference is made to the ברית קודש, which uses two words also used in 1QM 10:9-10, but in quite a different manner. It is a ‘holy covenant’ rather than a ‘holy people’ that is mentioned there. Thus the similarity to Daniel is at best verbal, not

⁷⁴⁷ Yadin (1962:305) notes that this ‘sentence is influenced by Dt. iii, 24 (Ps. cxiii, 5-6), with additions from Ps xcii, 6 (lxxi, 19).’

⁷⁴⁸ Bardtke (1955:411, n. 114) proposes to reconstruct the lacuna after ‘understanding’ ‘and those who make many righteous,’ in analogy to Daniel 12:3, *מצדיקי הרבים*.

⁷⁴⁹ Mertens (1971:104) translates the phrase ‘Volk der Heiligen des Bundes,’ i.e. ‘people of the saints of the covenant.’ He rightly notes that the DSS occasionally use the term ‘holy ones’ or ‘saints’ for their own adherents, though elsewhere it refers to angels.

⁷⁵⁰ He, however, restores the lacuna [... *ביראת האל* ...], not [*ה*] *בינ[ה]*, as in DSSEL.

⁷⁵¹ Seventy weeks have been decreed for your people and your holy city, to finish the transgression, to make an end of sin, to make atonement for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal up vision and prophecy and to anoint the most holy *place* (NASB; Hebrew: *שבעים שבועות נחתה עלי עמך ועל עיר קדשך לכלא הפשע לחתם השארות ולכפר עון* (וילהביא צדק עלמים ולחתם חזון ונביא ולמשח קדש קדשים). It is possible that there is a typographical error and he meant Daniel 8:24 where the words *עם קדשים* appear.

conceptual. It is much more likely that the writer has in mind Deuteronomy 14:2,⁷⁵² a verse suggested by Yadin (1962:306, n. 10) and which uses the expression עַם קְדוֹשׁ, ‘holy people,’ or Exodus 19:5-6.⁷⁵³ However, in Exodus the Hebrew word in the expression ‘holy nation’ is גּוֹי, not עַם (perhaps for stylistic reasons?) but the general tenor of Exodus 19:5-6 (and of Dt 14:2 for that matter) seems to be more in line with 1QM 10:9-10 than any reference in Daniel. The expression עַם קְדוֹשׁ, ‘holy people,’ is used in Deuteronomy 7:6; 14:2, 21; 28:9; Isaiah 62:12; 63:18; and Daniel 8:24; 12:7. Of these, Deuteronomy 7:6; 14:2 and 28:9 are most closely related to 1QM 10:9-10. In each case it is also made clear that Israel is only God’s special, chosen people if they keep his commandments. That is also a point made in 1QM 10:9-11 (see also below on 1QM 12:1-5).

The context in 1QM 10 indicates that the עַם קְדוֹשׁ בְּרִית are those who have not only been chosen by God, but have also by implication chosen themselves to adhere to God’s covenant and set themselves apart from others who are not doing so. In addition, they have been taught God’s statutes and laws and gained wisdom/insight and understanding. Not only that; they are also the ones ‘who hear the glorious voice,⁷⁵⁴ and see the angels of holiness, whose ears are uncovered, and who hear deep things’ (1QM 10:10-11; my translation, but cf. DSSEL). It is not clear whether those ‘whose ears are uncovered and who hear deep things’ refers back to the ‘people of the holy ones of the covenant’ or to the angelic figures mentioned in the immediately preceding section, but it seems more likely that it completes the description of God’s people.

The term ‘saints’ is of course used frequently for NT believers (e.g. Ac 9:13; Ro 1:7; Phil 1:1; Col 1:26). Furthermore, Colossians 1:26-27 speaks about the ‘mystery which has been hidden from the *past* ages and generations, but has now been manifested to His saints, to whom God willed to make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory’ (NASB). New Testament believers are thus recipients of God’s secrets (cf. Mk 4:11) and should be able to

⁷⁵² ‘For you are a holy people to the Lord your God, and the Lord has chosen you to be a people for His own possession out of all the peoples who are on the face of the earth’ (NASB; Hebrew: כִּי עַם קְדוֹשׁ אֱתָה לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ יְבָרְכֶךָ. בְּחַר יְהוָה לְהֵיוֹת לוֹ לְעַם סֻגְלָה מִכָּל הָעַמִּים אֲשֶׁר עַל-פְּנֵי הָאָדָמָה).

⁷⁵³ “‘Now then, if you will indeed obey My voice and keep My *covenant*, then you shall be My own possession among all the *peoples*, for all the earth is Mine; and you shall be to Me a kingdom of priests and a *holy nation*.’ (NASB, italics added; Hebrew: וְעַתָּה אִם-תִּשְׁמָעוּ תְּשִׁמְעוּ בְּקוֹלִי וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם אֶת-בְּרִיתִי וְהֵייתֶם לִי סֻגְלָה מִכָּל-הָעַמִּים כִּי-לִי כָל-הָאָרֶץ וְאַתֶּם תְּהִיוּ-לִי (מִמְלַכַת כֹּהֲנִים וְגוֹי קְדוֹשׁ)).

⁷⁵⁴ Delcor (1955:389) translates ‘the voice of the Venerable,’ ‘la voix du Vénéralable.’ Similarly also Dupont-Sommer (1962:184): ‘the voice of the venerated (Being).’ Dupont-Sommer (1962:184, n. 5) adds that the expression ‘venerated Being’ is ‘obviously ... applicable to God,’ but thinks that in the present context it may well refer to the Teacher of Righteousness. He refers the reader to CD 20:28, 32 where it is stated that the members of the community were ‘always obeying the Teacher’ (l. 28, DSSEL) and ‘listened attentively to the Teacher of Righteousness’ (l. 32, DSSEL). Due to the parallelism between these texts and 1QM 10, he suggests that in the present context too the Teacher of Righteousness is in view, but I think the reference is more likely to God.

understand ‘deep things’ of the faith, though this exact phrase is not used in the NT.⁷⁵⁵ The DSS community/ies too believed that they were privy to God’s secret council. Wenthe (1998:309-310) rightly notes that this section of 1QM 10 shows that the community considers itself ‘as having direct access to the mysteries of Scripture and the divine economy.’ He quotes Rowland (1982:116; cf. Wenthe 1998:310) who summarizes this well:

Two facts emerge in this passage. Firstly, the community believes that it has been privileged to hear the voice of God himself. This need mean no more than that the community had ascertained the true meaning of Scripture through the inspired interpretation of it. But the second feature of this passage would seem to indicate that we have to do there with more than merely an indirect apprehension of the divine will: the reference to the community as those who have seen angels. The juxtaposition of hearing God’s voice and seeing angels looks remarkably like the kind of visions of the heavenly world familiar to us from the apocalypses.

In other words, this particular column would appear to contain a section of apocalyptic, even if the whole work can hardly be so described.

The rest of the column continues with its praise of God’s creation. The question that arises is why such a praise of God’s creation should be included in a section on prayers to be said at the beginning, during, or at the end of a war. Perhaps the answer is in the fact that the soldiers’ minds should be turned away from the imminent danger and onto the person who, according to the beginning of the column, would be among them to fight for them. If God was powerful enough to bring the whole of creation into being, he would surely be strong enough to help his army in times of war.

3.5.2.4 1QM 12:1-5

It is not clear where the prayer or hymn starts that continues in 1QM 12:1 (which begins with כִּיָּא, thus continuing a thought from at least the previous line). It is different from the content of the extant part of column 11, so presumably it started somewhere towards the end of that column that has been lost. Line 6 of column 12 is blank, thus marking a major break. Schultz (2009:75) considers 1QM 12:1-5 the last part of a section of prayers to be said before the army is deployed, and labels the last part of the prayer ‘You will deliver’ (תִּסְגִּיר; he thinks this starts in 11:13). The next line, 1QM 12:7, begins a new section of prayers to be said during the war or after the deployment of the army.

⁷⁵⁵ The word עֲמֻקָּה, which is used in 1QM 10:10 appears only once in the same figurative sense in the OT, in Psalm 92 (verse 5, but verse 6 is also important) where the Psalmist speaks about the deep thoughts of God which cannot be understood by senseless people. In the NT, Paul complains that the Corinthians are unable to understand the deeper things of the faith because of their carnality (1 Cor 3; cf. also Hbr 5:11-14).

The writer addresses God in prayer. He says that there are ‘a multitude of [the]se holy ones in the heavens and hosts of angels in the lofty abode of your holiness, to [praise] your [truth]’ (1QM 12:1, my translation, but cf. DSSEL). Davies (1977:100) observes that the word ‘holy ones’ may refer either to humans or to angels, but in view of the parallelism of the verse rightly prefers the second option. The writer continues to say how God established ‘the chosen ones of the holy people’ (ובחירי עם קודש) for himself, and something or someone else (not extant) in ‘the lofty abode of your glory’ (1QM 12:2). Davies (1977:101) observes that the term בחיר, ‘elect’ or ‘chosen ones,’ has a special meaning in the DSS, being ‘almost a synonym of אביון in that it denotes those who are to be saved at the end.’ They are ‘to some extent the “élite” who are to be their nation’s spiritual leaders, perhaps understood in terms of the “remnant” of O.T. prophecy’ (Davies 1977:101). In other words, they are a select group, specially chosen by God. Davies finds the expression עם קודש בחירי unnecessarily cumbersome and thinks that the word בחירי may be a later addition to narrow ‘down the righteous party from the whole nation to a select part of it’ (1977:101). However, the term may be reminiscent of such scriptures as Deuteronomy 7:6 and 14:2 where Moses says to Israel: ‘For you are a holy people to the LORD your God; the LORD your God has chosen you to be a people for His own possession.’ In these scriptures the term ‘holy people’ (עם קודש) occurs, as well as the verb בחר. Admittedly, the noun בחיר does not appear there (in fact, it only occurs seven times in the MT, six of which are in Isaiah), but the idea of a chosen people is nevertheless present. Davies’ idea that it may be understood in terms of the “remnant” is, I think, sound, considering the context.

The next line expresses what God has done for these ‘chosen ones’ of his: ‘And (the) mercies of [your] blessing[s]⁷⁵⁶ and your covenant of peace you have engraved for them with the stylus of life⁷⁵⁷ in order to reign []⁷⁵⁸ for all appointed times of eternity’ (1QM 12:3; my translation, but cf. DSSEL). The phrase ‘covenant of peace’ which is used here occurs several times in the OT. In Numbers 25:12 God promises to zealous Phinehas that he will give him his covenant of peace (הַנְּגִי גִתְּךָ לִּי אֶת־בְּרִיתִי שְׁלוֹם),⁷⁵⁹ and that it would be a ‘covenant of perpetual priesthood’ (וְהָיְתָה לִּי וְלִזְרַעוֹ אֶתְרִי בְּרִית כְּהֵנָּת עוֹלָם; Nu 25:13). In Isaiah 54:10 God promises the exiles who are soon to return that his ‘lovingkindness will not be removed’ from them and his ‘covenant of peace’ will not be shaken (וּבְרִית שְׁלוֹמִי לֹא

⁷⁵⁶ Yadin (1962:314-315) restores the lacuna and reads ‘mercy of blessing [for Thy thousands],’ i.e. וחסדי ברכה [לאלפיכה], after Exodus 20:6 (see p. 314-125, n. 3).

⁷⁵⁷ וברית שלומכה חרתה למו בחרט חיים למלוך.

⁷⁵⁸ Yadin (1962:314-315) restores ‘[over them],’ i.e. ע[ליהם].

⁷⁵⁹ Carmignac (1956:254) points out that MT, Aquila, Theodotion and the Targum have ‘my covenant of peace’, whereas the LXX and Peshitta simply have ‘covenant of peace’ (i.e. no 1cs suffix on ברית). He also points out that Ben Sira 45:24 has a ‘covenant of peace’, but that it is unclear whether 1QM refers to the Numbers reference (according to LXX and Peshitta), or that in Ben Sira (Carmignac 1956:254-255).

(תְּמוּט). In Ezekiel 34, in the context of promising Israel a leader after his own heart, i.e. a new David, God promises the exiled people that in that future day he will be their God, they will be his people, and that he will ‘make a covenant of peace with them’ with the result that they will be able to live securely in their land again (Ezk 34:23-25; the quotation is in v. 25: וְכָרַתִּי לָהֶם בְּרִית שְׁלוֹם). A couple of chapters later, in the wider context of the prophecy of the valley of the dry bones, God again promises Israel a new leader, a new Davidic king; Israel will keep God’s commandments, and he, God, will ‘make a covenant of peace with them; it will be an everlasting covenant’ (Ezk 37:26: וְכָרַתִּי לָהֶם בְּרִית שְׁלוֹם בְּרִית עוֹלָם יְהִי). None of these references is close to 1QM 12:3, though the idea of reigning eternally may indicate a possible connection with the Ezekiel verses. However, if there is any reminiscence, it is very vague indeed.

The words ברית and שלום appear together in a similar construction, though not in a construct relationship as in 1QM 12:3, also in 1QM 17:7; 4Q491 (4QM^a) fr. 11 ii:18; and in 4Q434 (4QBarkhi Nafshi^a) 7b:2. The expression in 1QM 17:7 will be discussed below. At 4QM^a fr. 11 ii:18 we find the expression [לי]שראל בכל מועדי [עולמים] ‘and the covenant of God [is] peace [for I]srael in all the times [of eternity]’ (my translation, but cf. DSSEL). Here the covenant that is (or results in) peace is made for all Israel, not just the select group of the ‘chosen ones’ as in 1QM 12:3. 4Q434 7b is a small fragment with only two partly preserved lines (4Q434 7b:2-3). The two lines read (DSSEL): ‘]from there their portion from the de[sert to a g]ate of hope. And he made with them *a covenant of peace* with the birds [of the heav]ens and the beasts of the field. And he made their enemies like dung, like dust did he pulverize them. Edom and Moab’ (italics added). The expression ‘a covenant of peace’ is literally ‘a covenant *for* peace’ (ברית לשלום), and is made with animals, which is reminiscent of Hosea 2:20 where God also promises Israel a covenant (though not ‘of peace’) ‘with the beasts of the field, the birds of the sky and the creeping things of the ground’ and that he will ‘abolish the bow, the sword and war from the land, and will make them lie down in safety’ (NASB). Egger-Wenzel (2010:49ff) however sees other biblical texts reflected: Genesis 1:25, 30; 9:2, 9-10, 16; and Isaiah 54:9; in other words, the covenant with Noah. This may well be so, but in my opinion the reference to Hosea is more likely, especially in view of the verbal resemblances: ‘gate of hope’ (Hs 2:17; פֶּתַח תְּקוּהָה; cf. 4Q434 fr. 7b:2, [ל]פֶּתַח תְּקוּהָה) and ‘with the beasts of the field and the birds of the heavens’ (עַם-תְּחִית הַשָּׂדֶה וְעַם-עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם; Hs 2:20; my translation), which appears, though reversed (and using ארץ instead of שדה), also in 4Q434 fr. 7b:2-3: ויכרות להם ברית לשלום עם עוף [הש]מים וחית הארץ. The theme of the removal of their enemies is evident in the last phrase of Hosea 2:20. Egger-Wenzel’s final conclusion after studying all these texts, including the occurrences in Ben Sira 45:15, Isaiah 54:10, Ezekiel 34:25; 37:26; and Malachi 2:5, is however sound. She notes that they ‘share the idea of an

unbreakable covenant of promise' which is granted '[a]fter a situation of judgment ... for all time either to a priest or to the postexilic reunited Israel (understood as the cultic community)' (Egger-Wenzel 2010:63). The purpose of the 'covenant of peace' is to give unconditional joy and blessing forever and 'to make possible an invulnerable life in justice under God's loving devotion as well as the recognition of YHWH beyond Israel' (Egger-Wenzel 2010:65).

Returning to 1QM 12:3, it is also necessary to comment on the author's assertion that the 'covenant of peace' is '*engraved ... with the stylus of life.*' This expression is unique; it occurs nowhere else in the DSS or the MT. Yadin (1962:315) however notes that the image of engraving with a stylus is 'frequent' in Jubilees and Enoch.⁷⁶⁰ The word 'stylus' only occurs twice in the MT (Ex 32:4; Is 8:1), and the verb ⁷⁶¹חרת only once, but this occurrence may be significant. It appears in Exodus 32:16 where we are told that the tablets of the law that Moses was given on Mt Sinai 'were God's work, and the writing was God's writing engraved (חרית) on the tablets.' In the DSS the verb appears twenty-two times, several of these referring to 'engraved statutes.' A 'stylus' (חרט) is an engraving tool, i.e. it is used for hard surfaces, stone or wood (Ex 32:4; Aaron took the people's gold and 'fashioned it with a graving tool' into the golden calf). The idea is evidently that God's laws and his covenant are irreversible; they are set in stone and thus cannot be removed. The whole line is apparently an encouragement to those about to enter into war and thus facing the danger of death. No matter what happens, they can be secure in the knowledge that God himself directs the battle they are entering (1QM 12:4-5) and is in fact with them (1QM 12:7ff).

1QM 12:4-5 goes on to describe the nature of the service of God's holy ones: they are 'commissioned' (DSSEL) or 'mustered' (Yadin 1962:314; the Hebrew word is פקד) 'by their thousands and ten thousands together with' God's 'holy ones,' which are, apparently, 'his angels' (1QM 12:4, my translation, but cf. DSSEL).⁷⁶² The section ends with the words 'and directing them in battle [] the earthly adversaries by trial with your judgments. With the elect of heaven [they] shall prev[ail]' (1QM 12:4-5, DSSEL).⁷⁶³ Dupont-Sommer (1962:187) sees in line 5 a reference to the resurrection of the dead from

⁷⁶⁰ In both books the idea of the heavenly tablets appears, in Jubilees with the added connotation that they are 'engraved.' That word is in fact not used in Enoch, though it may be inferred from his reference to the heavenly tablets that are 'inscribed.'

⁷⁶¹ This is the word indicated by DSSEL. Van der Ploeg (1955:412) suggests as alternatives חור (with the idea of 'boring a hole,' Gesenius 2003b:266) and חרר ('to burn,' Gesenius 2003b:308-309) which he suggests means 'to pierce, perforate,' or an Arabic root meaning 'to write with accuracy.' These would make sense too, but in view of the possible connection with Exodus 32 I believe the option adopted above is more likely.

⁷⁶² Yadin (1962:314) restores the lacuna before 'his angels' and reads: '[and the host] of Thine angels.'

⁷⁶³ Yadin (1962:314) restores the lacunae and reads: 'for strength of hand | in battle [to subdue] them that have risen against Thee on earth by the strife of Thy judgments, but with the elect ones of heaven are [Thy] blessing[s].'

Daniel 12:2. He translates this line quite differently from DSSEL, interpreting קמי after the lacuna not as adversaries, but rather ‘those who arise’ *in resurrection*: ‘in the battle [together with] those who will rise from the earth when Thy judgments are disputed, and with the vi[ctorious] elect from heaven.’ However, he seems to be the only scholar to interpret the text in this way. In fact, if this reading were accepted this would be the only reference to the resurrection of the dead in 1QM. The interpretation is, I think, not impossible, but seems to be unlikely. Delcor (1955:390), Yadin (1962:314), Duhaime (1995:121), García Martínez (1996:106), Vermes (1998:175), DSSEL and DSSSE all interpret the word as ‘those who arise’ *in battle* or for revenge. Delcor (1955:390, n. 7) in fact suggests that the three extant letters קמי be restored as נקמי, ‘avengers,’ taking into account a lacuna before these letters.⁷⁶⁴

3.5.2.5 1QM 13

In Schultz’s division of the scroll, the prayer(s) in 1QM 13 are part of a series of prayers to be spoken after victory in war has been obtained (Schultz 2009:75). Duhaime (1995:121, n. 60) thinks that the prayers between the end of column 12 and column 14:1 ‘were probably recited on the battlefield.’ The two opinions need not necessarily be mutually exclusive, as prayers after victory may still be recited on the battle field, but in view of the blessings and curses recited in 1QM 13:2-6 it seems more appropriate that this prayer is one which is spoken before or during a battle rather than after victory. The column starts with an instruction to priests, Levites and elders to ‘bless, from their position, the God of Israel and all his truthful works’ (1QM 13:1; Duhaime 1995:123). The instruction is to ‘denounce there Be[li]al and all the spirits of his lot’ (1QM 13:1-2) and to bless the God of Israel. The words to be spoken in the blessing and curse follow (1QM 13:2-3 and 4-6 respectively). All this is written in third person indirect style. There are *vacats* at the end of lines 3 and 6 and at the beginning of line 5. It appears as if the contents of these lines was spoken antiphonally by different people, and it is possible that lines 7ff belong to this section as well.

With 1QM 13:7 begins a prayer directed to God by a group of people (the pronoun ‘we’ is used). The speakers pray to the ‘God of our fathers’ and bless his name. They say

⁷⁶⁴ The lacuna has been variously restored. Yadin (1962:314) reads להכריע (‘force to one’s knees’, HALOT); DSSSE has ולהכניע (‘subdue’ an enemy, BDB). DSSEL and Duhaime (1995:120) both leave the lacuna blank. Evidently Dupont-Sommer (1962:187) reads something like יחד עם, ‘together with’, but like the other restorations this is pure conjecture.

they are ‘a people of []’, but the lacuna does not indicate what they might be saying.⁷⁶⁵

The speakers continue to assert that God

[m]ade a covenant with (or perhaps ‘for’? – the preposition is ל, not עם or את) our fathers (אבותינו), and he will establish it for their seed/descendants for the appoint[ed] times of eternity. And in all the ordained times/testimonies of your glory there is/was a remembrance of Your []⁷⁶⁶ in our midst for help (to the) remnant and survival/survivors⁷⁶⁷ for (the sake of) your covenant and to re[count] the works of your truth and the judgments of the mighty works of your wonders (1QM 13:7-9, my translation, but cf. DSSEL; see also Dupont-Sommer 1962:188-189).

Carmignac (1956:375) points out that the phrase ‘covenant made with our fathers’ is reminiscent of 1 Kings 8:21 where Solomon in his prayer at the Temple dedication says that he built the temple to provide a ‘place for the ark, in which is the covenant of the LORD, which he made with our fathers when he brought them from the land of Egypt’ (NASB; the relevant Hebrew clause is בְּרִית יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר כָּרַת עִם-אַבְתֵּינֵנוּ). Carmignac (1956:375) further refers to Nehemiah 9:8. There Nehemiah mentions that God made a covenant with Abraham, promising him and his descendants the land of Canaan, thus having ‘fulfilled his promise’ (וַתִּקֶּם אֶת-דְּבָרָיו). It is of course not certain whether these scriptures were indeed in the mind of the writer. But even if not, he is sufficiently grounded in the traditions reflected in both Kings and Nehemiah to allow the conclusion that the covenant referred to in this context could be considered either as the Abrahamic or, perhaps more likely, the Mosaic covenant, as interpreted by the author’s community. In either case, the writer calls upon the speakers to praise God for his covenant faithfulness, both in the past as well as the present. In view of God’s past faithfulness, the people can praise him in the midst of the war for his assistance in their battle against the forces of evil. Also in view of these past proofs of God’s faithfulness, they are assured of victory in the present eschatological battle, despite the fact that only a few ‘survivors’ or a ‘remnant’ are left. This indicates that these words are indeed spoken in the context of a fierce battle where some (or even many) of the soldiers have died.

In the following lines the writer assures the people that they have indeed been selected by God to be part of the Sons of Light who walk in God’s truth and who are assisted by the Prince of Light (שר מאור, a phrase unique in the DSS and MT, though in CD 5:18 the expression שר האורים, ‘Prince of Lights,’ appears). In contrast, the Sons of Darkness are influenced by Belial, the angel of darkness, who was ‘made ... for the pit’ (DSSEL, 1QM 13:11) and only desires evil things (1QM 13:12) and makes his followers

⁷⁶⁵ Van der Ploeg (1955:413) tentatively restores [גרלכה] (‘of your lot’); Yadin (1962:321) prefers [עוֹלָם] (‘eternal;’ taken up also by Davies 1977:106); DSSE has [נה]ל[תכ]ה, (your inheritance).

⁷⁶⁶ Yadin (1962:323) tentatively restores [היית]כה, ‘your being.’ DSSE proposes [חסד]כה, ‘your mercy,’ instead.

⁷⁶⁷ Hultgren (2007:358, n. 87) rightly observes that the language here is reminiscent of CD 1:4-5 and, perhaps less so, of CD 3:12-13.

‘walk ... in darkness.’ The Sons of Light, on the other hand, are the ‘lot of [God’s] truth’ and thus experience God’s power on their behalf and rejoice in it (1QM 13:13). The writer asserts that God helps and supports those who are oppressed (1QM 13:14). The next two lines are rather broken but the writer seems to refer to God’s final appointed battle in which darkness will be overcome by light and the Sons of Darkness will be forever removed (1QM 13:15-16).

3.5.2.6 1QM 14

The prayer which starts properly at 1QM 14:4 is introduced by instructions (1QM 14:1-4) that show that this is a prayer after victory. The soldiers who have returned to their camp after battle are commanded to cleanse themselves from the impurities of war, especially contact with corpses,⁷⁶⁸ and then go back to the battle line and there pray the prayer that is outlined in 1QM 14:4ff. Fletcher-Louis (2002:453) astutely notes that the prayer in this column is a ‘mirror image’ of the prayer in column 12:7-16, in that there the warriors prayed as they went out to the battle field, whereas in the present context they pray after having returned from victory. In 1QM 14 there is no recitation of a curse, and since ‘the curse already recited [1QM 13] has now been effective and God’s enemies have been defeated’ (Fletcher-Louis 2002:453-454), it is not necessary to repeat it.

In the prayer, the people are called upon to say: ‘Blessed is the God of Israel who keeps faithfulness to/for his covenant (השומר חסד לבריתו) and the appointed times of salvation for the people of his redemption’ (1QM 14:4-5; my translation, but cf. DSSEL). Though the exact phrase השומר חסד לבריתו does not appear in the MT, it is reminiscent of such scriptures as Deuteronomy 7:9, 1 Kings 8:23, Daniel 9:4, and 2 Chronicles 6:14 where the expression שֹׁמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד occurs (cf. Yadin 1962:325).⁷⁶⁹ With the exception of Deuteronomy 7:9, these are also prayers where either the king or someone else calls upon God in supplication. In 1 Kings 8 and 2 Chronicles 6 Solomon prays at the dedication of the Temple. Daniel 9 is a petition for forgiveness before Daniel receives the third of his four visions (see the relevant part on this chapter earlier in this thesis). In Nehemiah 1 Nehemiah prays to God for mercy on his captive people Israel.

Only Deuteronomy 7 is not the recitation of a prayer. Here Moses exhorts the people on the brink of entering Canaan to remember that their God is indeed a covenant keeping God, who has brought them out of Egypt and would just as certainly lead them

⁷⁶⁸ See Numbers 19:16 where it is written that those who touch any corpse in the field shall be unclean for seven days. The details of the cleansing ritual are outlined in the following verses (cf. Van der Ploeg 1955:414).

⁷⁶⁹ See also Nehemiah 1:5 which reads שֹׁמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד.

into the Promised Land. In the context of 1QM 14, this is the closest of the scriptures just mentioned since both texts consider a time of God's deliverance in a war or war-like situation. In Deuteronomy 7:1-11, Moses exhorts Israel that after God had delivered nations stronger than Israel into their hands on their entry into Canaan, they must refrain from making alliances with them, especially marriage alliances, since this would lead to apostasy. On the contrary, all vestiges of foreign worship must be destroyed, and they must keep God's laws because of his faithfulness to the covenant with them. In 1QM 14, the warriors express their gratitude to God for his faithfulness in the battle which they have just won. Just as in Deuteronomy, the enemy seems to have been stronger than they were, but God granted them victory. They have experienced God as the covenant-keeping God, who both in the past and the present proved himself to be the faithful God who keeps his word to his people, and they are praising him for the victory they have achieved.

The prayer continues to show how God had enabled the warriors despite their weaknesses (1QM 14:5; 'he called those who stumble unto wondrous [accomplishment]s;'⁷⁷⁰ ויקרא כושלים ל[גבורו]ת; DSSEL). The nations were gathered by God for destruction 'without remnant,' with the result that even though the warriors had 'melted hearts,' they are now able to sing praises to the God who taught 'the feeble warfare,' and gave strength to the weak so they could stand (1QM 14:5-7).⁷⁷⁰ Deuteronomy 7:1-2 instructs the Israelites to destroy the enemy completely, and in a similar manner this is happening in this eschatological war. It is difficult to establish what the middle of 1QM 14:7 expresses, since there is a lacuna, but the end of the line continues to note that through 'those whose way is perfect shall all the wicked nations come to an end' (DSSEL), and none of their mighty warriors will be able to stand (1QM 14:8). The victorious warriors continue to pray: 'we are the rem[nant of your people].⁷⁷¹ Blessed] be your name, God of lovingkindnesses, who keeps the covenant for/to our forefathers' (1QM 14:8, my translation; וואנו שא[רית ברוד] שמכה אל החסדים השומר ברית לאבותינו, 'and with all our generations you have made wonderful your lovingkindnesses for the rem[nant of the people of Israel⁷⁷²] during the dominion of Belial' (1QM 14:9). This is basically the same idea as before in line 4, only that here God is the 'keeper of the covenant to the forefathers.' Just as God had been faithful to his covenant with the ancestors, so he proved to be faithful to his word in the time of this final eschatological war (cf. Schultz 2009:295). The scene is reminiscent of Joshua 21:43-45 where God is said to have been faithful to the

⁷⁷⁰ ולפתוח פה לנאלמים לרנן בגבור[ת] [רפות ללמד מלחמה ונותן לנמוגי ברכים חזוק מעמד.

⁷⁷¹ So with DSSSE; DSSEL does not have 'of your people.' I am adopting the reconstruction which is also suggested by Yadin (1962:326).

⁷⁷² So with Yadin (1962:426). DSSSE restores instead 'rem[nant of your inheritance]. Both of course are conjectures and make good sense in the context.

forefathers of Israel in giving them the land of Canaan and not allowing any enemy to prevail over them. Though no direct lexical dependence on this text is obvious, the idea is certainly there. Schultz (2009:295) points out that the Sons of Light are only called ‘remnant’ in columns 13 and 14 of 1QM. He suggests that the remnant ‘are those who have not only made it through the time of Belial’s rule, but through the first stage of the eschatological war, the War against the Kittim as well. They are the ones who were tested in the War against the Kittim (16:11-17:1) but did not fall’ (Schultz 2009:295-296).

The author continues by stating that even though Belial tried to deceive people, he ‘with all the mysteries of his hatred’ was not able to lead God’s true followers ‘away from your covenant’ (1QM 14:9-10; מבריתכה [ו]ן הדיחונן לוא שטמתו רזי שבכול רזי). The word used for ‘lead astray’ (the Hiphil of נדה) is the same as that in Deuteronomy 13:6, 11, 13, 14 where false prophets, who lure Israel away (also the Hiphil of נדה) from following the Lord, must be stoned to death. In Deuteronomy 13:14 the subject of נדה is ‘men of Belial’ (אנשים) (בני-בלעל; cf. Yadin 1962:328), like in the present passage. Unlike those who, as in 1QM 1:2, ‘violate the covenant’ and thus ally themselves with God’s enemies, those who are true to God cannot be led astray. On the contrary, God actually drove Belial’s ‘spirits of destruction’ away from his followers and rescued them in their distress, whereas the followers of Belial suffered destruction (1QM 14:10-11; cf. also Hultgren 2007:360). Because of God’s mighty acts his people can praise and exalt him at all times, day and night (1QM 14:12-14a, DSSSE). This is reminiscent of Jesus’ words in the Olivet discourse where he warns his disciples not to be deceived by false prophets, and that for the sake of the faithful ones these days would be shortened, in order that they might remain faithful and not also be led astray (Mt 24:11-13, 22). It is also reminiscent of Daniel 12:1 where those who are written in God’s book, i.e. are faithful to him to the end, will be rescued in the final war.

1QM 14:14-15 concludes this prayer by referring to the ‘mysteries of [God’s] wonderful acts’ which ‘r[ais]e up to you those from the dust and ... bring low among divine beings’ (Duhaime 1995:127). The extant part of column 14 ends with a new prayer addressed directly to God: ‘Rise up! Rise up, o God of Gods! Lift yourself up with vig[or] [al] [the S]ons of Darkness. And your great light ... [] [... Sh]eol shall burn (?) in a fir[e ...]’ (1QM 14:16-18; Duhaime 1995:127).

3.5.2.7 1QM 15-16

Though the word ברית does not appear in 1QM 15-16, these columns form the context of columns 17-19 and must therefore be briefly summarized. The beginning of column 15 is

no longer concerned with prayers, but is the continuation of a new section obviously begun at the end of column 14 (1QM 15:1 starts with the conjunction כִּי) outlining the rigours of the eschatological war to be fought. From column 15 onwards, 1QM describes the war against the Kittim (Schultz 2009:276), but with the added dimension (from what is known from column 1) that this war is international and universal (Schultz 2009:277). The writer states that this is a time of distress and difficulty for the people of God, though they will experience God's redemption (1QM 15:1). 1QM 15:2-3 mention the 'king of the Kittim and ... the army of Belial' against whom the Sons of Light will be fighting. 1QM 15:4 begins a new section with instructions regarding the duties of the High Priest, who together with the other priests, the Levites and 'the men of the rule' is told to read out the required prayer 'of the appointed time for wa[r...]' (Duhaime 1995:129), arrange the battle lines, and encourage the soldiers (1QM 15:4-6). The exact words of the prayer and words of encouragement follow in 1QM 15:7ff, apparently up to at least the end of the extant column, but possibly continuing through 16:1. 1QM 16:2 is blank, and 1QM 16:3-9 gives instructions on the blowing of trumpets at the correct intervals at the start of battle. After yet another blank line, 1QM 16:11-13 continues with instructions regarding the blowing of trumpets and directions for the High Priest to strengthen the hearts of the soldiers (1QM 16:13-end).

3.5.2.8 1QM 17

Column 17 has a number of lacunae due to the poor preservation of the column. In the first five lines and in line 7 there is a tear/hole after the first two or three words, and in the first four lines the end of the column is also missing. This makes it somewhat difficult to interpret the text correctly.

Whether the column continues instructions to the High Priest regarding the strengthening of the soldiers is difficult to say, but the first 3 lines still seem to have to do with how to conduct the war. 1QM 17:1 begins by stating that 'He shall appoint their retribution with burning' (DSSEL, Yadin 1962:338) or 'set peace for them in the burning' (Duhaime 1995:133) for 'those tested by the crucible' (DSSEL). It seems that God is the actor here. However, after the lacuna the text apparently implies a human actor: 'He will sharpen the weapons of war, and they shall not be blunt until []' (my translation, but cf. DSSEL & Duhaime 1995:133), though Yadin (1962:338) interprets the text differently by translating 'His weapons of war,' and explaining that this refers to 'the Sons of Light, who

will fight His [i.e. God's] war' (Yadin 1962:339). Perhaps the line concluded with words to express the utter destruction of 'wickedness', since רשע is the first word of line 2.⁷⁷³

The rest of line 2 gives directions for a group addressed in the second person plural to 'remember the judgment [of Nadab and] Ab[i]hu, sons of Aaron, in whose judgment God showed himself to be holy in the eyes of [] but Ithamar he preserved⁷⁷⁴ for himself for a covenant []⁷⁷⁵ of eternity' (1QM 17:2-3; my translation, but cf. DSSSEL; the rest of line 3 is not inscribed). This seems to be a warning to a group consisting at least of priests, and probably also of Levites. Yadin (1962:339) comments that the 'choice of Nadab and Abihu ... as example[s] is intended to prove that God deals justice even to the most select.' The text apparently refers to Leviticus 10:1-6 (cf. Yadin 1962:339), but a covenant for priests is not mentioned in that passage. Only Numbers 25:12-13 refers to 'a covenant of peace,' an 'eternal covenant of priesthood' (בְּרִית עוֹלָם עוֹלָם),⁷⁷⁶ where it is given to Phinehas, son of Eleazar. It seems the writer of 1QM has transferred this honour back to Phinehas' father and brother, who both obeyed Moses' instructions when Nadab and Abihu were judged by God for their insubordination and presumption. If the connection to both Leviticus 10:1-6 and Numbers 25:12-13 is in view here, it is perhaps also better to follow Duhaime's translation of the beginning of line 2, 'he set peace for them in the burning.' The point of the comparison is apparently to call upon the hearers/readers to take courage and obey God in every detail, to be zealous like Phinehas as they go into war, and not to follow their own devices as Nadab and Abihu had done and as a result had suffered God's judgment upon them. That is confirmed by the following lines which encourage the hearers/readers to strengthen [them]selves/be courageous (התחזקו), and not to be afraid (1QM 17:4), especially in view of the fact that the enemies are destined 'for emptiness and for destruction' (literally 'their desire is for emptiness and for destruction,' לתהו ולבהו⁷⁷⁷ (תשוקתם), most likely an allusion to Genesis 1:2 (cf. Fletcher-Louis 2002:464).

The rest of 1QM 17:4 and the beginning of 1QM 17:5 is somewhat difficult to understand. DSSSEL translates: 'Their support is without [] and they do not [] of Israel is all that is and that will be. [] in all which exists for eternity.' Line 5 then continues to state how 'today' (i.e. presumably the day of the war) is God's 'appointed time to subdue and humiliate the prince of the realm of wickedness' (1QM 17:5-6) on the one hand, and to

⁷⁷³ Yadin (1962:338) in fact restores the end of line 2 to read '[there come to end all nations].'

⁷⁷⁴ DSSSE reads 'by judging them God showed his holiness to the eyes [of all the people, and Eleazar] and Ithamar he confirmed for the covenant of an everlasting [priesthood]' (cf. Carmignac 1956:380, who also restores 'priesthood').

⁷⁷⁵ Yadin (1962:338) restores the lacuna '[of the appointed times].'

⁷⁷⁶ Carmignac (1956:380) suggests that the lacuna between the words לברית and עולמים might be restored כהונת, which would fit perfectly, and in addition is almost exactly the wording of Numbers 25:13 (cf. DSSSE).

⁷⁷⁷ Fletcher-Louis (2002:464) observes that this word, which occurs only three times in the MT, namely at Genesis 3:16, 4:7 and Song of Songs 7:11, 'carries with it the specific sense of primeval craving towards sin.'

grant deliverance for his own chosen people on the other by sending them support through the angel Michael (1QM 17:6). This and the next line are somewhat obscure due to lacunae that were restored from a fragment (according to Duhaime 1995:132). There is also some uncertainty regarding the interpretation of the phrase למשרת. The Hebrew text reads וישלח עזר עולמים לגורל [פ]דותו בגבורת מלאך האדיר למשרת מיכאל באור עולמים להאיר בשמחה ברית ישראל ('and he sent everlasting help to the lot of his redemption by the strength/mighty deeds of the noble angel, for the authority⁷⁷⁸/service/servant⁷⁷⁹ of/for Michael in everlasting light, to cause to shine with joy the covenant of Israel;' my translation).

The phrase למשרת מיכאל is variously translated: 'for the authority of Michael' (DSSEL; Yadin 1962:340);⁷⁸⁰ 'for the sway of Michael' (DSSSE); 'kingdom of Michael' (Vermes 1998:181); 'dominion of Michael' (García-Martínez 1996:112; Duhaime 1995:133, though with a note remarking that למשרת could mean 'office' or 'service'); 'serviteur de Michel' ('service/servant of Michael;' Delcor 1955:395); 'servant of Michael' (Dupont-Sommer 1962:194). As can be seen, the majority of the translations (mainly from the English speaking world) consider the expression למשרת to be derived from מְשָרָה ('authority, dominion,' DSSEL dictionary). However, there are good reasons for accepting the alternative reading 'service/servant of Michael' (adopted mainly by French speakers, and recently taken up by Fletcher-Louis 2002).

Fletcher-Louis (2002:458ff) expresses his dissatisfaction with the normal interpretation/translation of 1QM 17:4-9, saying that it is 'unlikely that there is either a straightforward identification between Michel and the prince of light or that there is precisely the kind of Michael-Israel parallelism usually envisaged' (Fletcher-Louis 2002:459). He notes that 'authority' or 'kingdom' 'is not the natural meaning for' משרת. Though משרה appears in Isaiah 9:5-6, it occurs nowhere else in the MT. In fact, one would normally expect משרת 'to be a substantive participle from the verbal root שרת "to minister", which is used frequently in the scrolls' (Fletcher-Louis 2002:460). In other words, it should be translated 'service' or 'servant.' Other verbal forms of this word also appear a number of times in 1QM. The word משרת also occurs in 1QM 13:4 where the phrase משרת אשמתו has been translated 'reprehensible rule' (DSSEL). Fletcher-Louis (2002:460) however points out that 1QM 13:4 is parallel to 1QM 13:5, 'where all the spirits of Belial's lot are denounced "for all their *service* (עבודת) of *impure uncleanness*

⁷⁷⁸ So according to the dictionary of DSSEL.

⁷⁷⁹ So with Fletcher-Louis (2002:459-461).

⁷⁸⁰ Yadin (1962:341) observes that there is a gap between the two words, but is not certain whether this is due to a fault in the leather or for some other reason.

(גדת טמאתם).” He therefore suggests that, since עבודה (construct of עבודה) is used in the sense of ‘religious service and worship,’ משרת too carries a similar connotation and should be translated ‘service’ both in 13:4 and in 17:6-7 (Fletcher-Louis 2002:460-461). In addition, the preposition ל before משרת is, in Fletcher-Louis’ opinion (2002:461), not adequately rendered by most translators. He criticises both Vermes (1998:181) and Duhaime (1995:133), the former for translating the prepositional phrase ‘of the kingdom of Michael,’ the latter for starting a new sentence with the phrase: ‘(He will set) the authority of Michael ...’ (Fletcher-Louis 2002:461). Fletcher-Louis (2002:463) goes on to argue that an alternative interpretation should be explored, namely ‘that Michael’s “service” is not the service directed *towards* Michael but the service which is somehow prescribed *by him, proper to him or in his possession*’ (italics added). In particular he suggests that column 17 is ‘evocative of the conceptual heart of the scroll in column 10,’ where the questions are posed, ‘who is like God’, and ‘who is like your people Israel?’ Fletcher-Louis (2002:461) sees an equation here, noting that Israel is like God because of her liturgical service in which she follows God’s pattern in creation and history. Thus he concludes ‘*to speak of “the service of Michael (who-is-like-God?)” is to speak of Israel, particularly her priesthood, in its cultic space and liturgical mode*’ (Fletcher-Louis 2002:461, italics his).

The connection between columns 10 and 17 is also evident, in Fletcher-Louis’ (2002:462) opinion, in the fact that in both there is an inexplicable space between two important words: in 1QM 10:9 between מִיָּא and כַּעֲמֹכָה, and in 1QM 17:7 between מִשְׁרָת and מִיִּכְאֵל.⁷⁸¹ He suggests that these gaps may function as a ‘signal to the deeper meaning of the text’ and for ‘further interpretive reflection’ of the same, as well as being a hint that the two texts are indeed interrelated (Fletcher-Louis 2002:461). This is of course conjecture, but it is not impossible. In view of the connection between the two columns, Fletcher-Louis (2002:462) suggests that God’s help in 1QM 17:6-7 ‘is for a godlike (כֹּאֵל) service (לְמִשְׁרַת מִיִּכְאֵל), which re-enacts God’s original creation of light where there was only chaos.’ In this way the passage picks up the creation themes reflected in columns 10:8-16 and 12:7-16 (Fletcher-Louis 2002:462-463). I find this argument convincing, and therefore adopt for 1QM 17:5-7 the translation ‘and he sent everlasting help to the lot of his redemption by the mighty deeds of the noble angel, for the service of Michael in everlasting light, to cause to shine with joy the covenant of Israel.’

The words בְּרִית יִשְׂרָאֵל in 1QM 17:6 constitute yet another problem in these lines. Though DSSEL lists these words in the transcription as indicated, the image of column 17

⁷⁸¹ He notes (Fletcher-Louis 2002:464, n. 157) that the gaps would allow for 8-9 and 4-5 letters respectively in columns 10 and 17. Furthermore, he also observes that according to the photographic plates there does not seem to be a fault in the leather which might warrant such a gap (Fletcher-Louis 2002:464, n. 157).

(DSSEL) actually does not show the word בְּרִית, but only the bottom part of the letter generally identified as ב (cf. Sukenik 1955: Plate 32). According to Duhaime (1995:132, n. 260) Sukenik (1955: Plate 47, fr. 4) supplied it from a fragment of 1QM, but the transcription of this fragment shows the letters]-ררת[, which certainly would not be identifiable as part of the word בְּרִית. However, the original image⁷⁸² of the fragment would seem to allow the identification of the letters as]-רית[(cf. Sukenik 1954 & 1955: Plate 47 of photographs, fr. 4) instead of the transcription]-ררת[(cf. Sukenik 1954 & 1955 Plate 47 transcriptions, fr. 4). In the transcription of the War Scroll itself, Sukenik (1955: Plate 32 transcriptions, line 7) supplies the letter ב but leaves the blank empty. Nevertheless, whoever initially suggested it, once it had been made this adaptation found wide acceptance (see DSSEL, DSSSE, García-Martínez 1996:112).

However, there are some dissenting voices. Bardtke (1955:417) for example supplies בבני instead of בְּרִית and thus translates: ‘um zu erleuchten durch Freude unter den [Kindern] Israels’ (‘in order to cause to shine through joy among the [children] of Israel.’ Vermes (1998:181) also adopts this reading. He translates 1QM 17:5-7 as follows: ‘This is the day appointed by Him for the defeat and overthrow of the Prince of the kingdom of wickedness, and He will send eternal succour to the company of His redeemed by the might of the princely Angel of the kingdom of Michael. With everlasting light He will enlighten with joy [the *children*] of Israel.’ Yadin (1962:340-41) on the other hand restores not בְּרִית but בית, i.e. ‘house of Israel,’⁷⁸³ and translates the whole section (1QM 17:6-7): ‘He will send eternal assistance to the lot to be redeemed by Him through the might of an angel: He hath magnified the authority of Michael through eternal light to light up in joy [the *house* of I]srael....’ In other words, the appearance of the term בְּרִית in this context is not certain. If it is not original, then this part of the text is of no consequence to the present inquiry. If it is, the text is at least somewhat obscure. In fact, either Vermes’ or Yadin’s reconstruction seems to make more sense than בְּרִית.

But granted that בְּרִית may be the correct reading, what does it mean that the ‘covenant of Israel’ will be caused to ‘shine with joy’ (my translation above) or that ‘By eternal light He shall joyfully light up the covenant for Israel’ (DSSEL) or ‘to illuminate with joy the covenant of Israel’ (DSSSE)? How in fact can a covenant be ‘illuminated’ or ‘shine with joy’? The idea that a covenant will shine is not present in the MT, though perhaps one might find a parallel in Psalm 119:105: ‘Your *word* is a lamp to my feet and a light to my path’ (NASB; italics added). However, there the noun ‘light’ appears, not the

⁷⁸² According to the photograph of the original in Sukenik (1954:Plate 47, fr. 4), there is a slight tear right in the middle of the letter, which could therefore possibly be a *resh*, *yod* or *waw*, or perhaps even a *bet*.

⁷⁸³ Yadin (1962:341) notes that בית fits exactly into the lacuna.

verb. Elsewhere in the MT we are told that God will ‘cause his *face* to shine upon’ his people (e.g. Nu 6:25; Ps 80:4, 8, 20 etc.). By implication one might possibly conceive of God’s covenant (perhaps identified with his word?) being said to ‘shine’ or ‘be caused to shine.’ On the other hand, maybe ‘covenant of Israel’ in the context of lines 7-8 could be a synonym for ‘children of Israel,’ (in which case Vermes’ and Yadin’s reconstructions are paraphrases), perhaps narrowly conceived of as the members of the writer’s community. In that case, one might detect an oblique allusion to Daniel 12:3, ‘Those who are wise will shine like the brightness of the heavens’ (NIV), though the word for ‘shine’ there is different (וְהַמְשַׁכְּלִים יִזְהָרוּ כְּנֹהַר הַקָּיֵץ).

1QM 17:7-8 continues to stipulate that the High Priest is to encourage his hearers that God is with them in this phase of the war and will grant them victory through divine assistance, mediated through the power and authority of the angel Michael (1QM 17:7-8). In view of the anticipated victory, the warriors, addressed as ‘sons of His covenant’ (בְּנֵי בְרִיתוֹ) must take courage in the fiery trial (i.e. battle) they are about to experience and trust God regarding their own existence (1QM 17:8-9). Perhaps the soldiers had become discouraged by defeat and needed to hear that in God’s unsearchable wisdom he allowed some (or even many) of them to suffer and die (hence the twice repeated word ‘crucible’ in the first 9 lines of 1QM 17), but ultimately he would grant them victory. ‘His mysteries concerning your existence’ (1QM 17:9, רִזְיוֹ לְמַעַמְדְכֶם), more literally ‘your standing,’ also points to a defeat: the soldiers did indeed *not* stand, but they fell. It is considered to be God’s ‘mystery’ because it is not explained why God allowed for the defeat of his soldiers in the first place.

The address ‘sons of his covenant’ is important, as it is a link to the previous mention of בְּרִית, if that is indeed the reading that is to be adopted in 1QM 17:7. It is not clear whether the covenant referred to is the Sinai covenant, the ancestral covenant with Abraham, or the priestly covenant with Phinehas, but I believe that in view of the preceding lines the covenant of eternal priesthood is meant. The text in 1QM 17:9 also links with 1QM 17:4, which begins with the same words, though without the direct address ‘sons of his covenant’: ‘But as for you, take courage ...’ (וְאַתֶּם הַתְּחַזְקוּ). The word translated ‘crucible,’ מִצְרֵף, has already appeared in line 1 where it referred to ‘those tested in the crucible’ (1QM 17:1, DSSEL).

Thus, considering all of 1QM 17:1-9, this whole speech (at least 1QM 17:1-9, but probably including 1QM 16:15-end as well⁷⁸⁴) is an address by the High Priest to the warriors, perhaps consisting partly of other priests or at least Levites (if only as the ones going into battle blowing trumpets; cf. the reference to Nadab and Abihu and Ithamar in lines 2-3),⁷⁸⁵ and most likely after a defeat, to encourage the soldiers who are soon to go out into yet another battle, to take heart, be courageous and fight bravely in view of God's assistance and the anticipated final victory. The warning in lines 1-3 would then be issued to prevent the warriors from doing their own thing but to fight exactly as prescribed in other parts of the scroll and observing the correct rituals as they did so.

Some of these rituals are described in 1QM 17:10ff. Once the High Priest has completed his speech, the other priests ('the priests' is a supralinear correction in 1QM 17:11) are told to sound the trumpets to array the battle lines against the Kittim, and then for the start of the battle. From the beginning of the battle and throughout its duration different trumpet signals are to be blown (1QM 17:11-end).

3.5.2.9 1QM 18

Column 18 starts with a report on how, with the assistance of God, the sons of Light are able to defeat 'the lot of Belial' and the Kittim, who are being completely destroyed (1QM 18:1-5). Apparently this is a battle which takes place on a single day, since line 5 makes reference to the sun setting on that day. It is a day of victory. Wenthe (1998:314) takes up Yadin's (1962:13) suggestion that there is an oblique reference to Joshua 10:13-14 at this point. Yadin (1962:13) further argues that the purpose of the following prayer 'is the request that God should perform a miracle as He did for Joshua,' and explains (Yadin 1962:222) that the prayer in this column is apparently spoken during the last pursuit on the final day of battle, 'which clearly recalls Joshua's pursuit and God's intervention and assistance.' I am not sure whether this prayer is one of petition before or during a battle; it seems rather to be a prayer of praise after the final battle has taken place. Davies (1977:81) similarly expresses uncertainty in this regard; he calls this prayer a 'hymn of thanksgiving' which, according to his heading, continues from 18:6b through 19:8. 1QM 18:6 instructs the High Priest as well as other priests and Levites and others (DSSEL supplies 'the chiefs

⁷⁸⁴ 1QM 16:15 is introduced by 1QM 16:11-14 where the instructions are for the priests to blow the trumpets to get the soldiers to array themselves and then start another battle, while the Chief Priest (כֹּהֵן הַרְוֹאֵשׁ) is told to encourage those going into battle. His words are then listed from line 15 onwards. Whether there are more instructions before yet another speech which continues in 17:1, or whether 17:1 simply continues the speech begun in 16:15 is not clear.

⁷⁸⁵ Unless the writer had in view something like the idea of a 'priesthood of all believers,' in which case the reference to Nadab and Abihu's death and the covenant with Eleazar and Ithamar would be considered applicable to a wider audience than just descendants of the Levites.

[of the battle lines and the men] of the army) to ‘bless the God of Israel there’ (i.e. apparently on the battle field). Because of the list of these participants in the prayer, Davies (1977:82) argues (rightly in my opinion) that it is more likely that the enemy has already been defeated at this point.

1QM 18:6bff contains the words of blessing to be spoken: ‘Blessed be your name, o God [of God]s, for you have magnified [yourself] with your people, doing wondrous things. And you have kept your covenant for us from of old, and the gates of salvation you have opened for us many times, so tha[t]/for the sake [of] your [co]venant []’ (1QM 18:6-8; my translation). In these lines we have the last two occurrences of the word ברית in this scroll (as far as it is extant). Yadin (1962:244) suggests these lines are a conflation of 1QM 13:7 and 14:4, which also both refer to God as the covenant keeping God (see above on these texts). The present prayer glorifies God who has assisted the Sons of Light in their fight against the evil Sons of Belial and the Kittim. God is praised for the wonderful things he has done to glorify himself and Israel by giving them victory in this last battle. By doing so, he has ‘kept’ his ancient ‘covenant.’ Once again it is not quite clear whether the Sinai covenant, the Abrahamic covenant or the priestly covenant is in view. For the option that the Abrahamic covenant is in view speaks the fact that Genesis 22:17, where God confirms his covenant with Abraham, includes the promise of land and victory of his descendants over the ‘gates of their enemies.’ On the other hand, the covenant blessings in Leviticus 26:7-8 and Deuteronomy 28:7 also include the promise that God will cause Israel’s enemies to be defeated before them, though in different words. In 1QM 18:7 the expression ‘gates of salvation’ is used, which does not occur in the MT (though there may be an allusion to Ps 118:19-21 and Is 60:18, cf. Yadin 1962:345). However, since the prayer is said in the context of a victory in a battle, one may argue that this included victory over ‘the gates of their enemies.’ In other words, God has acted in accordance with his ancient covenant promises to the patriarchs as well as to Israel, and dealt with goodness towards his people (1QM 18:8). Thus the soldiers can now pray: ‘You o God of righteousness have done [this] for the sake of your name’ (1QM 18:8; my translation, but cf. DSSSEL; ואתה אל הצדק עשיתה למען שמכה).

The remainder of the column apparently continues this prayer of praise after victory. The threefold repetition of the root פלא (‘be extraordinary, marvellous;’ HALOT) in 1QM 18:10 (line 9 is blank) shows the utter astonishment the people experience at the sight of this victory. They had experienced defeat (as indicated in the prayer in column 17), but now, by nothing short of a miracle, God has granted them victory, and they can only praise his mercy and redemption in removing their enemies from before them (1QM 18:10-11). Only because of God’s help and active intervention are the Sons of Light in

pursuit of their fleeing enemies (1QM 18:12-13). The extant part of the column concludes apparently with a description of how God brought about victory, but the text is rather broken (1QM 18:13-end). Column 19 seems to continue this prayer of praise.

Davies (1977:82; also 1978:33) interprets 1QM 18:10ff differently. He concurs with Yadin (1962:222-223) that this part of the prayer is a petition ‘to God to destroy the enemy himself,’ especially as daylight is giving way to nightfall. Perhaps, with Yadin (1962:222-223) one might argue that the prayer asks for a similar miracle as that in Joshua 10 where the sun did not set until Joshua had defeated several Canaanite kings at Gibeon. However, the whole tenor of the extant lines is in my opinion not one of plea but of praise for God’s help. Only the words ‘now the day is pressing upon us [to] pursue their multitude’ (DSSEL 1QM 18:12; ועתה היום איך לנו לרדוף המונם) and ‘Yours is the might, and the battle is in your hand’ (DSSEL 1QM 18:13b; לכה הגבורה ובידכה המלחמה) might indicate otherwise, but the following words again state how God had broken ‘the heart of warriors ... so that no one is able to stand’ (DSSEL 1QM 18:13a; וולב גבורים מגנתה לאין מעמד). I believe that these words praise God’s defeat of the enemy in retrospect; they are not a plea to do so prospectively. However, these and the following lines are too broken to be dogmatic, but in my opinion this is a better reading.

3.5.3 Concluding Remarks on בְּרִית in 1QM

The thirteen occurrences in 1QM of the term בְּרִית are not used in connection with the particular vocabulary of covenantal language that is found, for example, in CD or 1QS. There is no question on the part of the author about how his readers can become members of his community, or what is to be done if they violate its stipulations or even defect from it. The problem he addresses is completely different. He envisages a great coming war in which the members of his community have to fight at all cost and to the end to bring about the kingdom of God (though he does not use this term) against the wicked forces of Belial, who try to lead astray even the faithful adherents of the faith. The text seems to be for the DSS community what the later part of Revelation is for Christians: it describes a great conflict between God and his forces against the forces of evil, but also the ultimate victory of God and his people. The readers are encouraged to stand firm in this conflict, even though there will be many who will suffer or die in the course of it.

In order for God’s people to win the battle it has to be fought according to the precise rules and cultic regulations set out in the War Scroll, so the writer believes. Particularly important, therefore, is the recital of prayers and speeches in the latter part of the scroll which are heavily dependent on biblical language. As noted above, apart from

1QM 1:2, all the occurrences of ברית in 1QM are in the context of these prayers and speeches, and always based on usage in the HB, mostly from the Pentateuch. Especially Deuteronomy seems to have been significant in the writer's mind. The second occurrence of ברית in 1QM 10:9 was shown to be probably dependent on Deuteronomy 7:6; 14:2 and 28:9, especially in view of the fact that both the Deuteronomy verses and 1QM 10 point out that to be God's people Israel has to keep his covenant statutes. The occurrence in 1QM 12:3 on the other hand, while the context also was seen to be reminiscent of the same Deuteronomy verses as 1QM 10, refers rather to the covenant with Phinehas in Numbers 25. Though perhaps the more immediate reference in 1QM 13:7 was to 1 Kings 8:21 or Nehemiah 9:8 in terms of vocabulary and language use, the covenant referred to in both was that of the 'fathers', i.e. either the patriarchs or the Sinai covenant (or perhaps both). God as the covenant keeping God is mentioned in 1QM 14:4-5 and 8, as well as in 1QM 18:6-8, passages that were seen to be reminiscent of Deuteronomy 7:9; 1 Kings 8:23; Daniel 9:4 and 2 Chronicles 6:14. In 1QM 14:9-10 the writer apparently had Deuteronomy 13 in mind when he noted that Belial was not able to lure away the Sons of Light from God's covenant.

In 1QM 17:2-3 another reference to the priestly covenant was found, though the writer applied it to Phinehas' father Ithamar. Whether or not ברית is to be read in 17:7 is a debated question. However, if it is the correct reading, it was suggested that it was yet another reference to the priestly covenant. The last two references to covenant in 1QM are in column 18 where the writer again refers to God as the covenant keeping God. Whether or not there were more references to covenant in column 19 and the lost end of the document is not certain in view of the very fragmentary nature of 1QM 19.

4 Conclusion: Review and Preview

4.1 Review – Summary of Findings

4.1.1 Comparison of Important Terminology Used in Connection with ברית in Daniel and the DSS

In this study I endeavoured to give a detailed exegesis of contexts in Daniel and the DSS containing the word ברית. One of the aims of this task was to discover similarities and differences in terminology that would show the theological aims of the writers concerned.

The first expression that appears in Daniel as well as in the DSS is ש(ו)מר (ה)ברית, 'keeper of (the) covenant and (the) faithfulness.' It is used in this form as an epithet for God in Daniel 9:4 and CD 19:1 (quoting from Dt 7:9); but forms reminiscent of this formula do appear elsewhere in the DSS under scrutiny. Similar phrases also applying to God appear in 1QM: השומר חסד לבריתו, 'he who keeps faithfulness to his covenant' (1QM 14:4); and השומר ברית לאבותינו, 'he who keeps [the] covenant to our fathers' (1QM 14:8); but applying to the priests in 1QS 5:9: בני צדוק הכוהנים שומרי הברית ('the sons of Zadok the priests, who keep the covenant).

Like Deuteronomy 7:8, CD 19:1 appears to be written in the context of an exhortation by a leader to his hearers/readers, but due to the absence of a preceding context in CD 19, that is all that can be said. That in 1QS 5:9 the Zadokite priests are given a title elsewhere attributed to God shows how important the community considered their task as guardians of their covenant, since in the context it is clear that their particular interpretation of the Mosaic covenant is in view.

Significantly, the majority of the occurrences of the expression ש(ו)מר (ה)ברית, whether exact or with variations, take place in prayers, both in the MT as well as in the DSS. In the MT, the wider context in the prayers is the possible or real infidelity of Israel which is compared with God's unfailing faithfulness. In particular, both Daniel 9 and Nehemiah 1 and 9 point out that God's faithfulness is shown in the judgment that he has brought on Israel. In contrast, the prayer in 1QM 14 is one of thanksgiving after a battle of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness. God as the covenant keeping God showed his faithfulness by giving salvation to the Sons of Light. As God had kept 'the covenant with our forefathers,' so he had kept the warriors in the decisive battle against Belial and his forces. On the other hand, in both Daniel's prayer and in the DSS the indictment is found that Israel did not keep the covenant and its rules and regulations (משפטים, מצות etc.; cf. Dn 9:5; CD 2:18, 21). But in contrast to Daniel 9 where Daniel identifies himself with the people who had sinned, this is not expressed in the same way in CD. There it appears

the writer is more aloof and simply retells the past history of Israel, pointing out that the predecessors of the writer's community then started groping and seeking God. This may be simply because of the difference in genre, since Daniel 9:4-15 is a communal lament and confession, whereas CD records at this stage the history of the community. A similar confession of sin to that in Daniel 9 (also using 1cp verbs) is however found in CD 20:28 where the members of the writer's community come and confess their sins against God, whose covenant laws they have failed to keep (cf. also the covenant initiation ceremony in 1QS, esp. 2:24), but the context there is quite different from that in Daniel 9.

The link between ברית and חסד is apparent both in the HB and in the DSS, firstly in the formula just discussed, שמר הברית והחסד (Dn 9:4; CD 19:1), but also in the DSS in the expression ברית חסד which appears twice, at 1QS 1:8 and 1QH^a 27:7 (if the occurrence in 1QH^a 27:7 is accepted as the correct reading). In both cases the expression refers to the community's covenant to live by the Mosaic law according to their strict interpretation of it. For them living in this way is not a duty but a joy. In other contexts, however, חסד is not necessarily a covenant word.

Another term often connected with covenant which is used in Daniel's prayer, אהב (Dn 9:4, 'those who love him,' i.e. God), occurs with similar meaning also in the DSS, esp. in CD 3:2-3 where the writer refers to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as 'God's friends' (אהבים לאל; cf. also the expression בעלי ברית at 3:4) because they kept God's covenant. אהב occurs with the same connotation also in CD 19:2 ('those who love me') in the context of the quotation from Deuteronomy 7:9, and in CD 20:21 (which quotes Ex 20:6). The members of the community described in 1QS are called to 'love' that which God loves (1QS 1:3), including fellow covenant members (1QS 1:9), a sentiment shared by the writer(s) of 1QH^a (1QH^a 4:24; 6:10; 8:16, 22 etc.; probably also 4:28). Interestingly, the word does not occur in the extant part of 1QM, but this is not surprising since the purpose of this scroll is not a call to covenant faithfulness as such but an injunction to the Sons of Light, i.e. the sectarians, to take up the real, physical battle against the Sons of Darkness and to fight this battle exactly according to the ritual requirements in order to ultimately bring in the Kingdom of God.

The most favoured term for 'entering' the covenant used by the DSS writers is בוא ('enter'),⁷⁸⁶ especially the expression בואי ברית ('those who enter the covenant')⁷⁸⁷ which does not occur in the MT, and which seems to be a *terminus technicus* for the

⁷⁸⁶ See CD 6:11; 8:21; 9:2-3; 12:11; 15:5; 19:16, 33; 20:25; 1QS 1:2-3; 2:12, 25-26; 5:8, 20; 6:14-15; 10:10; 1QH^a 13:20; 21:9, 13.

⁷⁸⁷ CD 2:2; 3:10; 6:19; 8:1; 13:14; 19:13-14; 1QS 2:18.

members of the sect(s). Much more rarely used is כרת (CD 15:8; 1QM 13:7, both referring to biblical covenants as opposed to the sectarian covenant). Perhaps it is significant that in the MT there are only two occurrences where בוא is used to express the idea of people entering into a covenant (Jr 34:10; 2 Chr 15:12), two occurrences where God is said to bring people into a covenant with himself (Ezk 16:8; 20:17), and one occurrence where a person (Jonathan) brings another person (David) into 'a covenant of the Lord' (1 Sm 20:8). All of these incidents are found in relatively late texts. It appears that there has been a shift in terminology, and that late texts prefer בוא rather than כרת. Maybe the issue is also that in the DSS the initiative lies with the human party rather than God and that therefore the word בוא is used. By this time covenant ceremonies seem to have lacked the sacrificial element (at least with the DSS communities where no mention is made of accompanying sacrifices), which may explain the lack of use of כרת, which appears to have implied such ceremonies (cf. Gn 15).

Not quite so common as בוא to express the idea of entering into the covenant or upholding/establishing it is קום (e.g. CD 3:10; 4:9; 20:12; 1QS 5:10, 21-22; 8:10 etc.). In most of these instances it is actually the sectarians who are said to enter or uphold the covenant, rather than God, who is the more common subject in the HB, and at 1QS 5:10 the word is used instead of שמר, 'keep.' This shift in terminology indicates their theological bias: the sectarians took their interpretation of the Mosaic laws so seriously, that they used a word that in the HB is used mainly of God for their own upholding of these laws.

One of the words used for covenant breaking is עבר (Dn 9:11). In the DSS this word usually occurs with this meaning in connection with God's covenant, laws, stipulations etc. (cf. CD 1:20; 16:12 with reference to transgressing God's covenant; elsewhere with reference to transgressing God's laws, commandments, word etc: 1QS 5:7, 14; 8:22; 1QH^a 12:27; 20:24). However, in the covenant initiation ceremony of 1QS the word appears with the meaning 'enter' the covenant, just as in Deuteronomy 29:11 (1QS 1:16, 18, 20, 24; 2:10, 11). Like the author of Deuteronomy, the writer of 1QS uses this particular term in the context of a significant juncture in the life of the initiate: in Deuteronomy 29 the Israelites were on the brink of entering Canaan; soon they would cross the river Jordan into a completely new situation. In the same way, the initiate in 1QS, by entering into the covenant of the community, was making a complete break with his old life.

Transgressing the covenant in Daniel 9 is described in very general terms which includes the failure of the people to keep God's commandments, refusal to listen to God's

prophets and deliberate rebellion against God (Dn 9:4-6). In Daniel 11:32 and 1QM 1:2 the phrase מרשיעי ברית ('violators' or 'wicked ones of the covenant') is used to express the idea of those Jews who fall away from God's covenant. In Daniel 11 the 'falling away' has to do with accepting the evil ruler's religious reforms (which ultimately constituted idolatry or more literally 'godlessness' in the eyes of the writer of Daniel) instead of remaining steadfastly committed to God. Thus the מרשיעי ברית turn traitors who work hand in hand with the enemies of the Jews, which is also the sense the expression has in 1QM.

In CD Israel's transgression is explained by referring to specific offences. The writer defines it as 'finding loopholes' in the law (CD 1:18-19), which led to social injustice, such as corruption in court (CD 1:19), and ultimately to God's judgment on the nation. He also mentions transgressions of regulations such as the prohibition of eating blood (CD 3:6), grumbling and complaining against God (CD 3:8), refusing to perform God's commandments (e.g. to possess the land, cf. Nu 13; CD 3:7) and generally wilful disobedience because they preferred their own evil desires (CD 3:7; 2:16) and abandoning God's covenant (CD 3:11). 1QH^a 12:19 uses a rather rare synonym of זור, סור ('turn aside') to express the idea of people forsaking God's covenant, who according to this writer will be trapped in their own snares because they have turned to idolatry. In 1QM 14:9-10 the writer speaks about the danger that the Sons of Light may be lured away (נדה) from God's covenant by the Sons of Belial, but also asserts that this did in fact not happen because God protected his followers by driving away Belial's 'spirits of destruction' from them, rescuing them in their distress, and causing the followers of Belial to suffer destruction (1QM 14:10-11; cf. Dn 12:1).

Whenever the covenant is broken, curses (אָלָה)⁷⁸⁸ will be in operation. This is what Daniel confesses in his prayer (Dn 9:11), obviously referring to such texts as Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28 (though אָלָה does not appear in these chapters), or perhaps more likely Deuteronomy 29:20 where the word is used in the sense of curse. Similar sentiments appear in the DSS: CD 1:17; 15:2-3; 1QS 2:16; 5:12. In Daniel 9 and CD 1:17 the phrase 'curses of the covenant' (אלות הברית)⁷⁸⁹ refers to the Babylonian exile which had been God's punishment on his people because of Israel's unfaithfulness, but in 1QS 2:16 it appears in a curse formula during the initiation ceremony, which pronounces curses upon those who enter the community in case they fail to abide by its rules. In other words, the writer of 1QS considers his community as standing in direct succession to the Israel of the HB. In the context, 1QS 2:11-17 lists a number of curses spoken to initiates

⁷⁸⁸ This word can also be used in the sense of 'oath' (e.g. Dt 29:12; possibly CD 15:2).

⁷⁸⁹ CD also uses a quotation from Leviticus 26 to express the idea of covenant curses, i.e. the 'sword of vengeance, the vengeance of the covenant' (להרב נקמת נקם ברית); CD 1:17-18), which essentially makes the same point.

and patterned on Deuteronomy 29:18-20, with one significant change: the writer of 1QS replaces Deuteronomy's 'curse' with 'covenant' (1QS 2:13), indicating that he obviously considered the curses as part of the covenant. Lists of curses and blessings are also recited in 1QM 13:1-6, where, however, the curses are not spoken against members of the community who might be in danger of forsaking their commitment to God, but their enemies, the 'Sons of Belial' (1QM 13:4-6).

The opposite of transgressing the covenant is holding fast to it. For example, 1QS 5:3 refers to the 'majority rule of the men of the *Yahad* who hold fast to the covenant' (רוב (אנשי היחד המחזקים בברית), apparently a reference to the full members of the *Yahad*. Here the reference is obviously to the sectarian covenant, i.e. their commitment to keep the Mosaic law according to their strict interpretation of it. Though the verb חזק does appear quite frequently in Daniel 10-11, only Daniel 11:32 uses it in connection with ברית: here it is stated that 'those who know their God will be strong and act,' in contrast to those who 'act wickedly against the covenant' who are led astray to apostasy by the despicable person. Apart from חזק, 1QH also uses the synonym תמך (1QH^a 10:21) to express the idea of holding fast to the covenant.

One of the themes that permeates both the DSS and Daniel is that of proper 'insight' (בין), 'understanding' (שכל) and 'knowledge' (ידע) of God and his ways among believers. One might argue that these are not covenant terms in the strict sense of the word, but Deuteronomy 29:8⁷⁹⁰ uses the root שכל together with ברית, and Deuteronomy 7:9 calls on Israel to *know* that Yahweh is the Lord who keeps his covenant and mercy with those who love him. The prophets repeatedly point out that God will act in judgment against his people because of their continued failure to keep the covenant so that 'they may *know* that' he 'is the Lord' (e.g. Ezk 16:62 where both ברית and ידע occur; cf. also Ezk 6:7, 10 etc.⁷⁹¹). Therefore insight, understanding and knowledge of God's purposes are essential for members of his covenant in order to be able to do his will. However, the use of this terminology in Daniel and the DSS does have a slightly different nuances.

Daniel and his friends belong to the *maskilim* who were endowed with (divine) wisdom and understanding (Dn 1:4, ומשפילים בכל-הקמה וידעי דעת ומביני מדע, to such a degree that they were considered better than other wise men at the Babylonian court (Dn 1:17-20). Their wisdom and understanding enables them to interpret dreams and visions (Dn 2, 4), to

⁷⁹⁰ ושמרתם את-דברי הבְּרִית הזאת ונשיתם אתם למען תשפילו את כל-אשר תעשו: 'And you shall keep the words of this covenant and do them so that you may prosper/be successful/live wisely in all that you do.' ('Live wisely' is the translation in *The Message*).

⁷⁹¹ Ezekiel is particularly fond of the phrase וידעתם/ידעו כי-אני יהוה ('then you/they will know that I am the Lord') which occurs with slightly different verb forms many times in this prophecy.

serve human authorities while remaining faithful to their God (Dn 5, 6), understand ‘scripture’ (Dn 9), and to remain faithful, if necessary to death, in times of persecution when the temptation arose to abandon the God of Israel (Dn 3; 6; 11:32-45). Furthermore, the *maskilim* not only withstand the evil king’s pressure to conform to his religious reforms themselves, but teach others also, though at the cost of their lives in some instances (Dn 11:32-35). It is the ability to teach others and to understand scripture that receives particular attention in the DSS, sometimes using similar terminology, sometimes adding other words that express the same ideas.

Similar qualities to those mentioned in Daniel 1:4 are listed in 1QS 4:3 where we are told that the spirit of God endows the enlightened members of the sect with ‘humility, patience, abundant compassion, perpetual goodness, *insight, understanding*, and powerful wisdom’ (DSSEL, italics added; רוח ענוה ואִרְךָ אַפִּים וְרוֹב רַחֲמִים וְטוֹב עוֹלָמִים וְשָׁכַל וּבִינָה וְחִכְמָה (גבורה). The three roots שכל, בין and ידע, together with ברית, also appear in 1QS 4:22.⁷⁹² Likewise, in 1QM 10:9-11, in a prayer, the writer praises God and then states: ‘Who is like Your people Israel, whom You have chosen for Yourself from all the peoples of the lands; the people of the saints of the covenant (ברית), learned in the statutes, *enlightened in understand[ing]* (משכילי בינ[ה]) those who hear the glorious voice and see the holy angels, whose ears are open; hearing deep things’ (DSSEL, italics added). The root ידע occurs a few times in 1QM, but only once in close proximity to ברית (1QM 17:8).

The writer(s) of the Hodayot refers a few times to the insight he has received from God (1QH^a 5:19-20;⁷⁹³ 15:26-27; 18:4; 19:4 etc.), using at least two of the roots mentioned above, though not together with ברית. The Hymn Scroll makes it very clear that such insight and understanding only comes from God, who reveals it to the writer(s). CD does not use the root שכל, except once to refer to the teaching the *mebaqqer* is to do (CD 13:7), and twice to the office of *Maskil*, a term that has a special meaning in the DSS that it does not have in Daniel, denoting a teacher, instructor or overseer (e.g. CD 13:22; 1QS 3:10 etc.). CD starts, however, by calling on ‘those who *know* righteousness’ (יודעי צדק) to ‘*understand*’ or ‘*consider* the works of God’ (וּבִינּוּ בַמַּעֲשֵׂי אֵל) (CD 1:1-2). Later on, the writer calls on his hearers to ‘listen’ so he can make them ‘see and *understand* God’s works’ (CD 2:14; לראות ולהבין במעשי אל). New members will only be enrolled according to their *knowledge* (CD 15:15; דעתו), but otherwise CD uses less of this type of terminology than 1QS. What is obvious is that 1QS and Daniel are most closely connected with regards to

⁷⁹² ‘Thereby He shall give the upright *insight* into the *knowledge* of the Most High and the wisdom of the angels, *making wise* those following the perfect way. Indeed, God has chosen them for an eternal *covenant*’ (DSSEL, italics added; להבין ישרים בדעת עליון וחכמת בני שמים להשכיל תמימי דרכ כיא במ בחר אל לברית עולמים).

⁷⁹³ ‘The spirit of flesh that it might understand all these things and obtain insight into the council of [Your] great [wonders?]’ (DSSEL; בגדול אלה ולהשכיל בסוד[ה] פלא[ה] גדול רוח בשר להבין).

this ‘wisdom’ terminology. CD, 1QH^a and 1QM use some of the terms, but not nearly as frequently as 1QS, though all these scrolls (with the exception, perhaps, of 1QM, which has a different focus altogether) in their own way make the point that wisdom and knowledge are necessary and imparted by God.

One term not appearing in Daniel but fairly frequently in CD, 1QS and 1QH^a is *גלה*, to reveal. For the sectarians, God’s special revelation to them of both the ‘revealed’ and the ‘hidden things’ (e.g. CD 3:13-14; 15:13; 1QS 1:8-9; 8:1) of the law is one of the things that sets them apart from other Jews. They have committed themselves to live by the Mosaic law according to the interpretation and understanding they have received regarding its practical application, and anyone among them not doing so will be excluded, either temporarily or permanently, from the ‘holy drink’ or ‘meals’ or the fellowship in general, depending on the seriousness of the offence committed (e.g. 1QS 8:16-19). Particularly important among these ‘revealed things’ are matters of ceremonial purity, *halakhah*, and calendar observance (e.g. CD 3:14; 5:6-14; 1QS 1:9; 5:9; 8:15-16), emphases that are hardly or not at all prevalent in Daniel (except for Daniel 1 where Daniel refuses the defiled food of the Babylonian king and is allowed to exchange it for ‘pure’ vegetarian food).

Though no details are mentioned, Daniel’s wisdom is concerned with advising believers to live faithfully before God and observing his covenant in a secular environment in times of relative political security as well as in times of widespread religious persecution and temptation to apostasy. The last issue is particularly significant in Daniel 11. Moreover, Daniel is also concerned with wisdom in regard to what might be termed the ‘end times.’ As pointed out above, I believe that the book discourages believers from trying to work out when these times arise, but encourages them to trust that God will indeed bring about his kingdom in his time, and that faithfulness will be rewarded, even if it means suffering, persecution and perhaps death in the present.

The situation in the four DSS examined in this study seems to have been quite different. Though 1QH^a also gives the impression that the writer(s) were (sometimes) persecuted, this seems to have been more an individual experience, or the experience of a limited group, and based on the misunderstanding other Jews had of him (them). CD and 1QS describe communities that separated themselves from other Jews because of differences regarding the interpretation of ceremonial laws, calendar observance and *halakhah*, but one does not get from these documents the impression of widespread persecution because of their religion. Other Jews seem to have been free to observe the law according to their interpretation just as the sectarians were free to do so according to their

understanding. In fact, reference to the situation under pagan rulers, including a wicked persecutor of all adherents of Jewish religion, so prevalent in Daniel, is conspicuously absent from the DSS under examination, perhaps with the exception of 1QM. This appears to indicate that the communities described in CD, 1QS and 1QH^a lived either long before the Maccabean wars, or long afterwards, when different circumstances prevailed.

In 1QM, which probably describes an eschatological war that is still expected for the future, the enemy is described in terms reminiscent of Daniel 11:30-45, including Jewish apostates (מרשיעי ברית, Dn 11:32, 1QM 1:2; or עזבי ברית, Dn 11:30) who turn against their brethren and join the enemy (comprised of nations generally considered hostile to Israel: Edom, Moab, Philistia, the 'Kittim;' cf. 1QM 1:1-2; Dn 11:41 [which does not mention Philistia and the Kittim]). The suffering that believers experience is described in very general terms (1QM 1:11-12), but again reminiscent of Danielic terminology: it will be unlike any other suffering experienced so far (Dn 12:1). Unlike in Daniel 12, there is in the extant part of 1QM no hint of a future resurrection, but the description of the era after the final battle is similar in both Daniel and 1QM (cf. Dn 9:24; 12:3; 1QM 1:8-9).

The despicable person in Daniel 11 ultimately takes on and tries to eliminate the 'holy covenant' (ברית קדש), an expression that occurs nowhere else either in the MT or the DSS. In my opinion, the deliberate vagueness of the term (it is anarthrous) allows for different interpretations that need not be mutually exclusive, but should perhaps be viewed together. The major viewpoints regarding its reference are: (a) to the Jewish nation in general or more specifically to faithful Jews; (b) to Jewish religious institutions; (c) to the Mosaic law; (d) the service of the priesthood, but I believe that the phrase 'holy covenant' refers to the whole of Jewish religion, including the people (nation) who practice it, and the law and its institutions (temple, priesthood, etc.) that encompass it.

The writer of 1QM refers to a 'covenant of peace' (ברית שלום) in 12:3 where it applies to a select group of God's chosen ones, presumably the warriors fighting God's war, and whose immediate purpose is to give victory in war and whose ultimate purpose is to give unconditional, everlasting joy, blessing and life under God's rule to those to whom it is granted.

4.1.2 What Covenant(s) Do the Authors Mean When They Mention the Word ברית?

Any mention of or allusion to covenant in Daniel's prayer first and foremost denotes God's covenant with Israel at Mt Sinai. The people had constantly broken it and as a consequence had suffered the punishment of the Babylonian exile. In this connection, the phrase ש(ו)מר (ה)ברית ו(ה)חסד, 'keeper of the covenant and the faithfulness' (Dn 9:4), refers to God's promises for those who keep his covenant and threats to those who fail to do so, especially as outlined in Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28 (but also Dt 29-30), but also in prophetic threats, e.g. by Jeremiah. This also applies to the use of the formula in CD 19:1-2 (which is a quotation of Dt 7:9) and the reference to it in 1QM 14:4, though in the narrower context of 1QM the reference is a prayer of praise to God for his deliverance of the Sons of Light in the war against the Sons of Darkness, and therefore may possibly there also apply to the sectarian covenant.

All the DSS under consideration refer to the Sinai covenant in one way or another. In particular, the sectarian commitment to do whatever God requires is thoroughly based on their specific interpretation of the Mosaic law. On a number of occasions the Abrahamic (or patriarchal) covenant is mentioned. It is possible that it is this covenant that is meant by the expression ברית ראשנים, 'covenant of the first ones/forefathers' (e.g. CD 1:4; 6:2). However, the same expression appears in Leviticus 26:45 where it refers to the exodus generation and hence apparently also to the Sinai covenant, and this seems to be implied in both CD 1:4 and 6:2 (cf. also CD 3:10). Since the latter reference also mentions descendants of Aaron, the priestly covenant may also be hinted at. At CD 4:9-10 the related expression אל לראשנים אשר הקים ברית appears to refer either to the writer's own time or the predecessors of his community. Also related to the expression ברית ראשנים is the phrase 'covenant of the Fathers' (CD 8:18a; ברית האבות), which may originally have referred to the patriarchs, but was again extended to the exodus generation, and by implication to the writer's own generation.

The covenant with the priests, either in general or particularly that with Phinehas (or his father Eleazar and brother Ithamar) is the focus of 1QM 12:3 and 17:2-3. Indeed, the priests play an important role in the battles described in 1QM. Some scholars have identified the 'holy covenant' of Daniel 11 with the priestly covenant, but in my opinion this is too restricted a view (see above). There are also several references to the priestly covenant in 1QS, notably those instances where the writer refers to 'the men of his [i.e. God's] covenant' (1QS 5:9; 6:19). This scroll is the only document among those considered in this study where the *Zadokite* priesthood plays a particularly prominent role,

as can be seen by the designation ‘keepers of the covenant’ (1QS 5:2) which in the HB is reserved for God.

The sectarian covenant is labelled ברית אל (‘covenant of God’; cf. CD 3:11; 5:12; 7:5; 13:14; 14:2; 20:17), though in CD 3:11 the phrase refers to the Sinai covenant. This expression, therefore, shows that the sectarians considered their covenant as much a covenant with God as the biblical covenants, in particular since they believed that their interpretation of the Mosaic law was the only correct one. This is also evident in 1QS 5:13-18 where the writer calls upon his readers not to associate with outsiders, since they are not ‘counted within [God’s] covenant’ (1QS 5:18) because they do not know it, i.e. they have not received the correct interpretation of God’s law, and therefore are considered worthless (1QS 5:18-19). The text at 1QS 5 is reminiscent of Daniel 11:32 where those who know their God can teach others, while those who do not know their God collaborate with the enemy against their own people. At 1QS 8:15 the members of the community are said to belong to the ‘covenant of the *Yahad*,’ a term that only appears there and seems to emphasize the uniqueness of the sectarian commitment to their interpretation of the law of Moses.

Unlike CD, 1QS seems to have envisaged a particular group of fifteen spiritual leaders consisting of twelve members and three priests (1QS 8:1ff) who apparently were considered to have had particular knowledge of and insight into the ‘covenant of justice’ (ברית משפט; 1QS 8:9), or the ‘covenant of eternal statutes’ (ברית להוֹ { } עולם; 1QS 8:10). Both of these expressions are unique and appear to refer to the sectarians’ commitment to adhere to the law of Moses according to their interpretation of it, as it was revealed to this fifteen-member council who would presumably pass on these revelations to the remainder of the members. By pointing out that he considered this covenant a ‘covenant of eternal statutes,’ the writer once again makes the statement that the interpretation of the Mosaic law as practised by his community is in fact divinely sanctioned and therefore eternally valid, just as the divine covenants in the HB. Possibly a related text to 1QS 8:10 is 1QH^a 8:24 where the expression חוקי בריתך (‘statutes of your covenant’) appears. There the writer expresses the idea that God’s covenant entails rules and regulations which apparently refer to the Mosaic covenant stipulations (as interpreted by his community).

The unique reference to a ‘covenant of humankind’ in 1QH 4:27 possibly also refers to the initiation ceremony of new entrants, but the fragmentary nature of the text makes certainty impossible. Though 1QH^a 12:35 is not easy to interpret, it appears that in the phrase נעזבתי מבריתכה (I have been forsaken by/from your covenant) covenant refers to

people, i.e. the covenant community, against whom enemies have arisen. Unlike these enemies, who have forsaken him and his community (and, by implication, God), the writer holds fast to God's covenant (1QH^a 12:39).

Only CD mentions the 'new covenant' explicitly, and always applies it to something that happened in the past history of the writer's community to which he and his readers adhere. The prayer in Daniel 9 is the result of a reflection on Jeremiah's prophecies and some authors (Kline 1974; Steinmann 2008:474) have suggested that the answer he receives to his prayer actually refers to the new covenant, but the language of Daniel 9:24-27 is very vague indeed and allows for different interpretations and applications. In other words, while it is not impossible, the original referent was probably not the new covenant.

What is interesting is that in the DSS under consideration the Davidic covenant is not mentioned at all, unless one considers the reference to the messiahs of Aaron and Israel (CD 20:1) an oblique reference to this covenant. Daniel 11:22 mentions a 'prince of the covenant' which probably refers to a religious figure in the context, but it could also be a political figure, in which case one might consider this a veiled reference to the Davidic covenant. The same applies to Daniel 9:27. Nevertheless, it is obvious that neither in Daniel nor in CD, 1QS, 1QH and 1QM does the Davidic covenant play a significant role. For them the patriarchal, Sinai and priestly covenants are far more important. The DSS sect(s) obviously considered their own covenant, i.e. their commitment to keep the Mosaic law according to their own strict interpretation of it, an extension of these earlier covenants. For them to be in covenant meant to live strictly by the rules given in what they considered authoritative scripture according to their interpretation of it. In particular, it included the observance of specific rules concerning ceremonial purity, calendar and *halakhah* that were much more stringent than among other Jewish groups such as the Pharisees. To some extent, Daniel 9 makes similar points: Israel was punished because of their failure to live by God's laws, but Daniel does not identify any specific areas where this was the case, though there are possibly two exceptions. Firstly, in Daniel 1, which was not considered in this thesis, Daniel and his friends refuse to accept the diet of the pagan king for themselves. But probably this has to do with the second exception, that of idolatry: accepting such food may have included a more or less explicit acceptance of pagan religion, since it is possible that the meat on the menu was first offered to the Babylonian idols. Idolatry is also a theme in Daniel 9:27 and 11:31, both of which speak about the 'abomination of desolation' which the pagan ruler will set up in the Temple at Jerusalem. The very words used to describe this idol figure (whatever it was) show the abhorrence of the writer concerning the worship of any other gods but Yahweh. But otherwise, Daniel makes no mention of *halakhah*. The obvious reason for this is because

the purpose of Daniel is not to outline rules and regulations of righteous living, but to encourage readers to be faithful to God at all times, but particularly to stand firm during periods of persecution.

4.2 Preview – Where Hence?

The limited scope of this study did not allow me to go into details or even mention a number of areas which may promise interesting fields for further research. One of these is the possibility of allusions to the Davidic covenant in the DSS, both the ones considered here and others. It would also be interesting to investigate whether or not the covenant theme permeates all of Daniel, and if it does so, how. An approach similar to that of Wildgruber (2013) for the study of the remaining chapters of Daniel would probably be very profitable in this regard. The ever-increasing details of the wicked ruler and his kingdom in the visions has only been touched upon, and a more thorough investigation of this theme would probably be very enlightening.

A comparison of the significance of the covenant theme in Daniel and the DSS studied here with other late biblical books such as Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah could prove to be very profitable, as would be the investigation of the use of the word ברית and related terms in other DSS and comparing those findings with the ones made here.

Despite the fact that there have been a number of studies specifically concerned with the development of the different scrolls, this too is still a matter of debate and hence worthy of future study. For example, it appears to me that perhaps CD was a document that was written for the general membership and 1QS for the leadership – if this could be substantiated, it would explain why an apparently older document (CD and the related fragments in the Qumran caves) continued to be copied alongside the younger one (1QS and related documents from other caves).

Bibliography

A. Articles and Books

- Abegg, M. G. 2003. 'The Covenant of the Qumran Sectarians.' In: Porter, S. E. & de Roo, J. C. R. (eds.). 2003. *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. 81-97.
- Aitken, K. T. 1997. 'נָגִיד (nāgîd).' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 3. 20-21.
- Albani, M. 2010. *Daniel: Traumdeuter und Endzeitprophet*. (Biblische Gestalten, vol. 21). Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- Albright, W. F. 1955. 'New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible.' *BASOR* 140:27-33.
- Alden, R. L. 1999. 'דָּן ('dn)'; 'הַב ('hb)'; 'הָתַךְ (hātak).' *TWOT*. 12-13; 14-15; 334.
- Alexander, P. S. 2003. 'The Evil Empire: The Qumran Eschatological War Cycle and the Origins of Jewish Opposition to Rome.' In: Paul, S. M. et. al. (eds.). *Emanuel*. 17-31.
- Andersen, F. I. & Freedman, D. N. 1980. *Hosea: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. (Anchor Bible, vol. 24). Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
- Anderson, J. S. 2011. 'Curses and Blessings: Social Control and Self Definition in the Dead Sea Scrolls.' In: Lange, A., Tov, E. & Weingold (?), M. (eds.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures*. (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, vol. 140/1). Leiden, Boston: Brill. 47-60.
- Anderson, R. A. 1984. *Signs and Wonders: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. (International Theological Commentary). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Archer, G. L. 1974. 'The Hebrew of Daniel Compared with the Qumran Sectarian Documents.' In: Skilton, J. H. (ed.). *The Law and the Prophets*. 470-481.
- _____. 1979. 'Modern Rationalism and the Book of Daniel.' *BibSac* 136/542:129-147.
- _____. 1985. 'Daniel.' In: Gaebelien, F. E. (ed.). ©1976-1992. *Expositor's Bible Commentary: Old Testament*. (Electronic Version. Zondervan Reference Software, Version 2.6). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Ashley, T. R. 1993. *The Book of Numbers*. (NICOT). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Atkinson, K. M. T. 1957-58. 'The Historical Setting of the "War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness".' *BJRL* 40:272-297.
- Attridge, H. W., Collins, J. J. & Tobin, T. H. SJ. (eds.). 1990. *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins Presented to John Strugnell on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*. (College Theology Society Resources in Religion, 5). Lanham, New York, London: University Press of America.
- Austel, H. 1999. 'שָׁמֵם (šāmēm).' *TWOT*. 936-937.
- Avalos, H. 1998. 'Daniel 9:24-25 and Mesopotamian Temple Rededications.' *JBL* 117:507-11.
- Averbeck, R. E. 1997. 'הַט ('ht)'; 'כַּפַּר ('kpr).' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 2. 87-93; 689-710.
- Avi-Yonah, M. 1952. 'The "War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness" and Maccabean Warfare.' *IEJ* 2/1:1-5.
- Baer, D. A. & Gordon, R. P. 1997. 'הֶסֶד ('hesed II).' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 2. 211-218.
- Baldwin, J. G. 1978. *Daniel: An Introduction and Commentary*. (TOTC). Leicester, England: IVP.
- Bampfylde, G. 1983. 'The Prince of the Host in the Book of Daniel and the Dead Sea Scrolls.' *JSJ* 14/2:129-134.
- Bardtke, H. 1955. 'Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften: Die Kriegsrolle von Qumrān übersetzt.' *TLZ* 7/8:401-419.
- Barker, K. (ed.). 1999. *Zondervan NASB Study Bible*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.

- Barnes, A. 1834. *Albert Barnes' Notes on the Bible*. (Electronic Version.). E-sword version 10.1.0 (© 2000-2010).
- Bartholomew, C. G. 1995. 'Covenant and Creation: Covenant Overload or Covenantal Deconstruction.' *CTJ* 30/1:11-33.
- Batsch, C. 2010. 'Priests in Warfare in Second Temple Judaism: 1QM, or *Anti-Phinehas*.' In: Falk, D. K. et al. (eds.). *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited*. 165-178.
- Bauckham, R. 1998. *The Climax of Prophecy: Studies in the Book of Revelation*. London, New York: Continuum, T & T Clark.
- Baumgarten, J. M. & Schwartz, D. R. 1995. 'Damascus Document (CD).' In: Charlesworth, J. H. (ed.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 2, Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck); Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Baumgarten, J. M. 1983. 'The "Sons of Dawn" in CDC 13:14-15 and the Ban on Commerce among the Essenes.' *IEJ* 33/1-2:81-85.
- Baumgarten, J. M. et al. 2006. 'Damascus Document 4Q266-273 (4QDa-h).' In: Charlesworth, J. H. (ed.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 3, Damascus Document II, Some Works of the Torah, and Related Documents*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck); Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Beale, G. K. 1984. *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Beckwith, R. 2002. 'Early Traces of the Book of Daniel.' *TB* 53/1:75-82.
- Berg, S. A. 2007. 'An Elite Group within the *Yahad*: Revisiting 1QS 8-9.' In: Davis, M. T. & Strawn, B. A. (eds.). *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions*. Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans. 161-177.
- Bergsma, J. S. 2007. *The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran: A History of Interpretation*. (VTS, vol. 115). Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- _____. 2008. 'Qumran Self-identity: "Israel" or "Judah"?' *DSD* 15:172-189.
- Berkhof, L. 1938. *Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Bevan, A. A. © 1892. *A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. (2006 paperback version). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bevan, E. R. 1900. 'A Note on Antiochos Epiphanes.' *JHS* 20:26-30.
- Bickermann, E. 1979. *The God of the Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt*. (Studies in Judaism and Late Antiquity, vol. 32). Leiden: Brill.
- Birkeland, H. 1950. 'The Belief in the Resurrection of the Dead in the Old Testament.' *StTh* 3:60-78.
- Block, D. I. 1997. *The Book of Ezekiel Chapters 1-24*. (NICOT). Grand Rapids, Michigan; Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans.
- Block, D. I. 2006. 'Preaching Old Testament Apocalyptic to a New Testament Church.' *CTJ* 41:17-52.
- Boccaccini, G. 2005. 'The Covenantal Theology of the Apocalyptic Book of Daniel.' In: Boccaccini G. (ed.). 2005. *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans. 39-44.
- Boda, M. 2008. 'The Priceless Gain of Penitence: From Communal Lament to Penitential Prayer in the "Exilic" Liturgy of Israel.' In: Lee, N. C. & Mandolfo, C. (eds.). *Lamentations in Ancient and Contemporary Cultural Contexts*. (Symposium Series, vol. 43). Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature. 81-101.
- Boutflower, C. 1923. *In and around the Book of Daniel*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge/New York & Toronto: Macmillan.
- Boyce, M. 1990. 'The Poetry of the Damascus Document and its Bearing on the Origin of the Qumran Sect.' *RQ* 14/4:615-628.

- Bratcher, D. 2013. 'Travelers and Strangers: "Hospitality" in the Biblical World.' <<http://www.crivoice.org/travelers.html>> [accessed 12.07.2014].
- Brin, G. 2001. *The Concept of Time in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 39). Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill.
- Brown, R. 2002. *The Message of Numbers: Journey to the Promised Land*. (BST). Leicester, England: IVP.
- Brownlee, W. H. 1951. 'The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline: Translation and Notes.' *BASOR Supplementary Studies* no. 10-12. New Haven, Connecticut: American Schools of Oriental Research. 1-60.
- Bruce, F. F. 1966. *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. (Paperback). London: Paternoster.
- Brueggemann, W. 1998. *A Commentary on Jeremiah: Exile & Homecoming*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Buchanan, G. W. 1999. *The Book of Daniel*. (The Mellen Biblical Commentary Intertextual, Old Testament Series in Forty Volumes, vol. 25). Lewiston, New York; Queenston, Canada; Lampeter, UK: Mellen Biblical Press.
- Bunge, J. G. 1973. 'Der "Gott der Festungen" und der "Liebling der Frauen": Zur Identifizierung der Götter in Dan. 11, 36-39.' *JSJ* IV/2:169-182.
- Burrows, M. 1956 (© 1955). *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Viking.
- Burton, K. A. 2000. 'Numbers.' In: Freedman, D. N. & Myers, A. C. (eds.). *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans. 973-974.
- Butterworth, M. 1997. 'רַחֵם (rhm).' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 3. 1093-95.
- Campbell, J. G. 1993. 'Scripture in The Damascus Document 1:1-2:1.' *JJS* 44/1:83-99.
- Carmignac, J. 1956. 'Les Citations de l'Ancien Testament dans «La Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres».' *RB* 63:234-260; 375-390.
- Carpenter, E. & Grisanti, M. A. 1997. 'פֶּשַׁע (pš').' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 3. 706-10.
- Charles, R. H. 2006. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock. [reprint of the original 1929 publication by Oxford University Press].
- _____. n.d. *The Book of Daniel: Introduction Revised Version with Notes, Index and Maps*. (The Century Bible). Edinburgh: T. C. & E. C. Jack.
- Charlesworth, J. H. & Qimron, E. 1994. 'Rule of the Community.' In: Charlesworth, J. H. (ed.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 1, Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck)/Louisville: Westminster John Knox (in the text referred to simply as Charlesworth 1994, since he was responsible for the translation and introduction, whereas Qimron was responsible for the text; p. 1).
- Charlesworth, J. H. & Strawn, B. A. 1996. 'Reflections on the Text of Serekh-ha-Yahad found in Cave IV (1).' *RQ* 17:403-432.
- Charlesworth, J. H. 1997. 'Intertextuality: Isaiah 40:3 and the Serek Ha-Yahad.' In: Evans, C. A. & Talmon, S. (eds.). *The Quest for Context and Meaning*. 197-224.
- Chazon, E. G. 1998. 'Hymns and Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls.' In: Flint, P. W. & VanderKam, J. C. *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill. 244-270.
- _____. 2010. 'Liturgical Function in the Cave 1 Hodayot Collection.' In: Falk, D. K. et al. (eds.). *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited*. 135-149.
- Chisholm, R. B. 2002. *Handbook on the Prophets: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, Minor Prophets*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.
- Cholewinski, A. 1985. 'Zur Theologischen Deutung des Moabbundes.' *Biblica* 66/1:96-111.

- Christiansen, E. J. 1998. 'The Consciousness of Belonging to God's Covenant and What It Entails According to the Damascus Document and the Community Rule.' In: Cryer F. H. & Thompson T. L. (eds.). *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*. 69-97.
- Clifford, R. J. 1975. 'History and Myth in Daniel 10-12.' *BASOR* 220:23-26.
- Colless, B. E. 1992. 'Cyrus the Persian as Darius the Mede in the Book of Daniel.' *JSOT* 56:113-126.
- Collins, J. J. & Flint, P. W. (eds.). 2001. *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Vols. 1 & 2. (VTS vol. 83, 1 & 2. Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature). Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill.
- Collins, J. J. (ed.). 1979. *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*. (Electronic Version. Logos Library System). *Semeia* 14.
- Collins, J. J. 1974a. 'Apocalyptic Eschatology as the Transcendence of Death.' *CBQ* 36 (1974) 21-43.
- _____ 1974b. 'The Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High in the Book of Daniel.' *JBL* 93/1:50-66.
- _____ 1975. 'The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll.' *VT* 25/3:596-612.
- _____ 1979a. 'Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre.' In: Collins, J. J. (ed.). *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*. (Electronic Version. Logos Library System). *Semeia* 14:1-19.
- _____ 1979b. 'The Jewish Apocalypses.' In: Collins, J. J. (ed.). *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*. (Electronic Version. Logos Library System). *Semeia* 14:21-59.
- _____ 1984. *Daniel with an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature*. (The Forms of the Old Testament Literature, vol. 20). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- _____ 1990. 'The Meaning of "The End" in the Book of Daniel.' In: Attridge, H. W., Collins, J. J. & Tobin, T. H. SJ. (eds.). *Of Scribes and Scrolls*. 91-98.
- _____ 1993. *Daniel*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press.
- _____ 1997. 'The Expectation of the End in the Dead Sea Scrolls.' In: Evans, C. A. & Flint, P. W. (eds.). *Eschatology, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans. 74-90
- _____ 1998. 'New Light on the Book of Daniel from the Dead Sea Scrolls.' In: García Martínez, F. & Noort, E. (eds.). *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of A S van der Woude on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*. Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill.
- _____ 2007a. 'Sectarian Consciousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls.' In: LiDonnici L. R. & Lieber, A. (eds.). *Heavenly Tablets*. 177-192.
- _____ 2007b. 'The Nature and Aims of the Sect Known from the Dead Sea Scrolls.' In: Hilhorst, A., Puech, E. & Tigchelaar, E. (eds.). *Flores Florentino*. 31-52.
- _____ 2009. 'Beyond the Qumran Community: Social Organization in the Dead Sea Scrolls.' *Dead Sea Discoveries* 16: 351-369.
- _____ 2010a. *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans.
- _____ 2010b. 'Tradition and Innovation in the Dead Sea Scrolls.' In: Metso, S; Najman, H. & Schuller, E. (eds.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*. 1-23.
- _____ 2010c. *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. (2nd ed.). Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans.
- Conrad, J. 1998. 'נדב' *ndb*.' *TDOT*, vol. 9. 219-226.
- Coppes, L. J. 1999. 'רָהַם (rāham).' *TWOT*. 841-43.
- Craigie, P. C. 1983. *Psalms 1-50*. (Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 19). Waco, Texas: Word Books.
- Cross, F. M. 1964. 'The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert.' *HThR* 57/4:281-299.
- _____ 1966. 'The Contribution of the Qumrān Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text.' *IEJ* 16/2:81-95.

- _____. 1995. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. (3rd ed.) Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- _____. 2003. 'The Structure of the Apocalypse of "Son of God" (4Q246).' In: Paul, S. M. et. al. (eds.). *Emanuel*. 151-158.
- Cryer F. H. & Thompson T. L. (eds.). 1998. *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*. (JSOTS 290. Copenhagen International Seminar 6). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Daise, M. A. 2007. 'The Temporal Relationship between the Covenant Renewal Rite and the Initiation Process in 1QS.' In: Davis, M. T. & Strawn, B. A. (eds.). *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions*. Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans. 150-160.
- Dandamaev, M. A. 1989. *A Political History of the Achaemenid Empire*. (Translated into English by W. J. Vogelsang). Leiden, New York, København, Köln: Brill.
- Day, J. 1980. 'The Daniel of Ugarit and Ezekiel and the Hero of the Book of Daniel.' *VT* 30/2:174-184.
- David, P. 1993. 'Daniel 11,1: A Late Gloss?' in: van der Woude, A. S. (ed.). *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. 505-514.
- Davidson, A. B. 1904. *The Theology of the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Davies, P. R. 1977. *1QM, The War Scroll from Qumran: Its Structure and History*. (Biblica et Orientalia; Sacra Scriptura Antiquitatibus Orientalibus Illustrata, vol. 32). Rome: Biblical Institute.
- _____. 1978. 'Dualism and Eschatology in the Qumran War Scroll.' *VT* 28/1:28-36.
- _____. 1982a. *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the 'Damascus Document'*. Sheffield: JSOT. JSOTS 25.
- _____. 1982b. 'The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document.' *JJS* 33:287-301.
- _____. 1985 [1985-1998]. *Daniel*. (Old Testament Guides). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- _____. 1990a. 'Qumran and Apocalyptic or *Obscurum per Obscurius*.' *JNES* 49/2:127-134.
- _____. 1990b. 'The Birthplace of the Essenes: Where is "Damascus"?' *RQ* 14:503-519.
- _____. 1995. 'Who can Join the "Damascus Covenant"?' *JJS* 46 (Spr-Aut):134-142.
- _____. 2010. 'What History can we get from the Dead Sea Scrolls, and How?' In: Hempel, C. (ed.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*. 31-46.
- Davis, D. R. 2013. *The Message of Daniel: His Kingdom Cannot Fail*. (BST). Nottingham, England: IVP.
- Davis, M. T. & Strawn, B. A. (eds.). 2007. *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions*. Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans.
- Day, J. 1980. 'The Daniel of Ugarit and Ezekiel and the Hero of the Book of Daniel.' *VT* 30/2:174-184
- De Roo, J. C. R. 2003. 'God's Covenant with the Forefathers.' In: Porter, S. E. & de Roo, J. C. R. (eds.). 2003. *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. 191-202.
- De Vries, S. J. 1965. 'The Syntax of Tenses and Interpretation in the Hodayoth.' *RQ* 5/3:375-414.
- Delcor, M. (ed.). 1978. *Qumrân: Sa Piété, sa Théologie et son Milieu*. Paris: Leuven University Press.
- Delcor, M. 1955. 'La Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres ou le «Manuel du Parfait Combattant» de Qumrân.' *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 77:372-399.
- Denninger, D. 1997. 'דַרְשׁ (drš).' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 1. 993-999.
- Dequeker, L. 1993. 'King Darius and the Prophecy of Seventy Weeks: Daniel 9.' In: Van der Woude, A. S. (ed.). *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. 187-210.
- Dimant, D. 1984. 'Qumran Sectarian Literature.' In: Stone, M. E. (ed.). *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Assen, Maastricht: Van Gorcum/Philadelphia: Fortress. 483-550.
- _____. 1993. 'The Seventy Weeks Chronology (Dan 9,24-27) in the Light of New Qumranic Texts.' In: Van der Woude, A. S. (ed.). 1993. *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. 57-76.

- _____. 1994. 'Apocalyptic Texts at Qumran.' In: Ulrich, E. & VanderKam, J. (eds.). *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dam Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity, vol. 10). Notre Dam, Indiana: University of Notre Dam Press. 175-191.
- Domeris, W. R. & Van Dam, C. 1997. 'כלה' (*klh*) I.' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 2. 641-43.
- Dommershausen, W. 1964. *Nabonid im Buche Daniel*. Mainz: Grünewald.
- _____. 1995. 'כַּנָּפַר (*kānāp*) wing.' *TDOT*, vol. 7. 229-231.
- Douglas, M. C. 1998. Power and Praise in the Hodayot: A Literary Critical Study of 1QH 9:1-18:14. (A Dissertation Submitted to the faculty of the Divinity School in Candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy). Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago.
- _____. 1999. 'The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis Revisited: New Data for an Old Crux.' *DSD* 6/3:239-266.
- Doukhan, J. 1979. 'The Seventy Weeks of Dan 9: An Exegetical Study.' *AUSS* 17:1-22.
- Doukhan, J. B. 1987. *Daniel: The Vision of the End*. Berrien Springs, Michigan: Andrews University Press.
- _____. 1989. *Daniel: The Vision of the End*. (Revised ed.) Berrien Springs, Michigan: Andrews University Press.
- Dressler, H. H. P. 1979. 'The identification of the Ugaritic Dnīl with the Daniel of Ezekiel.' *VT* 29/2:152-161.
- Driver, S. R. 1900. *The Book of Daniel*. (The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (On-Line edition, available at <https://archive.org/stream/bookdaniel00drivgoog#page/n10/mode/2up>).
- _____. 1922. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. New revised ed. of 1913. (International Theological Library; Digital version: <http://www.archive.org/details/introductiontoli00driv>). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Duhaime, J. 1984. 'La Règle de la Guerre de Qumrân et l'Apocalyptique.' *Science et Esprit* 36:67-88.
- _____. 1988. 'The War Scroll from Qumran and the Greco-Roman Tactical Treatises.' *RQ* 13:133-153.
- _____. 1995. 'War Scroll (1QM, 1Q33), Cave IV Fragments (4QM1-6 – 4Q491-496), War Scroll-Like Fragments (4Q497).' In: Charlesworth, J. H. (ed.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, vol. 2: Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr; Louisville: Westminster John Knox. 80-203.
- _____. 2004. *The War Texts: 1QM and Related Manuscripts*. (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls, 6). London, New York: T & T Clark International (A Continuum Imprint).
- Dupont-Sommer, A. 1962 (© 1961). *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. Cleveland, New York: The World Publishing Company.
- Efron, J. 1987. *Studies on the Hasmonean Period*. (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, vol. 39). Leiden, New York, København, Köln: Brill.
- Egger-Wenzel, R. 2010. 'Covenant of Peace (ברית שלום) – An Eschatological Term?' In: Liesen, J. & Beentjes, P. C. (eds.). *Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2010: Visions of Peace and Tales of War*. 35-68.
- Eichrodt, W. 1961. *Theology of the Old Testament, vol. 1*. London: SCM.
- _____. 1967. *Theology of the Old Testament, vol. 2*. London: SCM.
- Eissfeldt, O. 1963. *Kleine Schriften*. 2. Bd. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck.
- _____. 1974. 'אֲדֹנָי 'ādhôn lord, the Lord.' *TDOT*, vol. 1. 59-73.
- Elwolde, J. 2007. 'The Hodayot's Use of the Psalter: Text-Critical Contributions (Book 1).' In: Peels, E. & Becking, B. Eds. *Psalms and Prayers: Papers read at the Joint Meeting of the Society of Old Testament Study and Het Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap in Nederland en België, Apeldoorn, August 2006*. (Oudtestamentische Studiën, vol. 55). Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- _____. 2010. 'The Hodayot's Use of the Psalter: Text-critical Contributions (Book 3: Pss 73-89).' *DSD* 17:159-179.

- Enns, P. 1997. 'Law of God.' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 4. 893-900.
- Eshel, E. & Eshel, H. 2000. 'Rescensions of the War Scroll.' In: Schiffman, L. H., Tov, E. & VanderKam, J. C. (eds.). 2000. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery*. 351-363.
- Eshel, E. 2007. 'The *Imago Mundi* in the *Genesis Apocryphon*.' In: LiDonnici, L.; Lieber, A. (eds.). *Heavenly Tablets*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Eshel, H. 2008. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans/Jerusalem, Israel: Yad Ben-Zvi.
- Evans, C. A. & Talmon, S. (eds.). 1997. *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*. (Biblical Interpretation Series, vol. 28). Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill.
- _____. 2003. 'Covenant in the Qumran literature.' In: Porter, S. E. & de Roo, J. C. R. (eds.). 2003. *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. 55-80.
- Evans, R. L. 2009. *The Covenants Speak: An Examination of the Adamic and of the Noahic Covenants*. Camden, North Carolina: Abundant Truth.
- Fabry, H.-J., Blum, E. & Ringgren, H. 2004. 'רַב (*rab*).' *TDOT*, vol. 13. 272-298.
- Falk, D. K. et al. (eds.). 2010. *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 91). Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Falk, D. K. 2011. 'Religious Life at Qumran.' In: Flint, P. W., Duhaime, J. & Baek, K. S. (eds.). *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 253-285.
- Fishbane, M. 1988. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. (Electronic Version: Oxford Scholarship Online 2003). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. 1961. 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament.' *NTS* 7/4:297-333.
- _____. 1970. 'Prolegomenon.' In: Schechter, S. *Documents of Jewish Sectaries, vol. 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*. (The Library of Biblical Studies). [New York]: Ktav Publishing House.
- _____. 2000. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*. (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- _____. 2004. *The Genesis Apocryphon*. (3rd ed.). Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- _____. 2007. *The One Who is to Come*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Fletcher-Louis, C. H. T. 2002. *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 42). Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill.
- Flint, P. W. 2001. 'The Daniel Tradition at Qumran.' In: Collins, J. J. & Flint, P. W. (eds.). *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Vol. 2. 329-367.
- Flint, P. W., Duhaime, J. & Baek, K. S. (eds.). 2011. *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Canadian Collection*. (Early Judaism and its Literature, no. 30). Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Flusser, D. 2007. 'Apocalyptic Elements in the War Scroll.' In: Flusser, D. & Yadin, A. (Translator). *Judaism of the Second Temple Period, vol. 1: Qumran and Apocalypticism*. Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans. 140-158.
- Fox, M. V. 2001. 'Wisdom in the Joseph Story.' *VT* 51/1:26-41.
- Freedman, D. N. & Miano, D. 2003. 'People of the New Covenant.' In: Porter, S. E. & de Roo, J. C. R. (eds.). 2003. *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. 7-26.
- Freedman, D. N. & Welch, A. J. 2006. 'שְׁקֵשׁ *šqš*.' *TDOT*, vol. 15. 465-469.
- Fretheim, T. E. 1997. 'אֲדוֹנָי (*'aḏōnāy*)'; 'אֱלֹהִים (*'elōhîm*)'; 'בֵּין (*byn*).' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 1. 275; 405-406; 652-53.
- Freyne, S. 1982. 'The Disciples in Mark and the *Maskilim* in Daniel: A Comparison.' *JSNT* 16:7-23.

- Frye, R. N. 1962. *The Heritage of Persia*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.
- Funke, T. 2012. 'Pinhas und Anti-Pinhas? Priestertum und Gewalt im 1 Makk und 1QM.' In: Berlejung, A. & Heckl, R. (eds.). *Ex Oriente Lux: Studien zur Theologie des Alten Testaments: Festschrift für Rüdiger Lux zum 65. Geburtstag*. (Arbeiten zur Bible und ihrer Geschichte, vol. 39). Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- Gammie, J. G. 1976. 'The Classification, Stages of Growth, and Changing Intentions in the Book of Daniel.' *JBL* 95/2:191-204.
- Gane, R. 2004. *Leviticus, Numbers*. (NIVAC). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- García Martínez, F. & Tigchelaar, E. J. C., (eds.). 1997. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition. Volume 1: 1Q1-4Q273*. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill.
- García Martínez, F. & Trebolle Barrera, J. 1995. *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices*. Leiden, New York, Cologne: Brill.
- García Martínez, F. 1996. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*. (2nd ed.). Leiden, New York, Cologne: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- _____. 2007. 'Invented Memory: The "Other" in the Dead Sea Scrolls.' In: Tigchelaar, E. J. C. (ed.). *Qumranica Minora II: Thematic Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls by Florentino García Martínez*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 64). Leiden, Boston: Brill. 187-218.
- _____. 2010a. 'Beyond the Sectarian Divide: The "Voice of the Teacher" as an Authority-Conferring Strategy in Some Qumran Texts.' In: Metso, S; Najman, H. & Schuller, E., (eds.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*. 227-244.
- _____. 2010b. 'The War Scroll and Related Literature: War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls.' In: Liesen, J. & Beentjes, P. C. (eds.). *Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2010: Visions of Peace and Tales of War*. 303-334.
- Gazov-Ginzberg, A. M. 1965. 'The Structure of the Army of the Sons of Light.' *RQ* 5:163-176.
- Gibson, A. 2000. *Text and Tablet: Near Eastern Archaeology, the Old Testament and New Possibilities*. (Ashgate New Critical Thinking in Theology & Biblical Studies). Aldershot; Burlington, USA; Singapore; Sydney: Ashgate.
- Ginsberg, H. L. 1953. 'The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant.' *VT* 3/4:400-404.
- Ginsberg, H. L. et. al. 2007. 'Messiah.' In: Berenbaum, M. & Skolnik, F. (eds.). *Encyclopaedia Judaica, vol. 14*. (Electronic Version, GVRL). (2nd ed.). Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA. 110-115. [Accessed on 13.2.2014 at <[http://0-go.galegroup.com.oasis.unisa.ac.za/ps/pdfViewer?inPS=true&prodId=GVRL&userGroupName=usa_itw&docId=GALE|CX2587513744&contentSegment=&searchId=R1&tabID=T003&resultListType=RESULT_LIST¤tPosition=1&searchResultsType=&accesslevel=FULLTEXT#docViewNav](http://0-go.galegroup.com/oasis.unisa.ac.za/ps/pdfViewer?inPS=true&prodId=GVRL&userGroupName=usa_itw&docId=GALE|CX2587513744&contentSegment=&searchId=R1&tabID=T003&resultListType=RESULT_LIST¤tPosition=1&searchResultsType=&accesslevel=FULLTEXT#docViewNav)>]
- Ginzberg, L. 1912. 'Eine Unbekannte Jüdische Sekte.' *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, Heft 6, 664-689.
- Gmirkin, R. 1998. 'Historical Allusions in the War Scroll.' *DSD* 5/2:172-214.
- _____. 2000. 'The War Scroll, the Hasidim, and the Maccabean Conflict.' In: Schiffman, L. H., Tov, E. & VanderKam, J. C. (eds.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery*. 486-496.
- Goff, M. J. 2004. 'Reading Wisdom at Qumran: 4QInstruction and the Hodayot.' *DSD* 11/3:263-288.
- Goldberg, L. 1999. 'בִּינָה (bîn)'; 'שָׂכָל (šākal) I.' *TWOT*. 103-104; 877.
- Goldingay, J. E. 1991. *Daniel*. (Word Biblical Commentary Vol. 30; paperback). Milton Keynes, UK: Word.
- Gooding, D. W. 1981. 'The Tyndale Old Testament Lecture, 1980: The Literary Structure of the Book of Daniel and its Implications.' *TB* 32:43-79.
- Gowan, D. E. 2001. *Daniel*. (Abington Old Testament Commentaries). Nashville: Abington Press.
- Grabbe, L. L. 1988. 'Another Look at the Gestalt of "Darius the Mede".' *CBQ* 50:198-213.

- Green, W. S. & Silverstein, J. 2014. 'Messiah.' In: *Encyclopaedia of Judaism*. Leiden/Boston: Brill Online, Reference. [accessed on 13.2.2014 at <http://0-referenceworks.brillonline.com.oasis.unisa.ac.za/entries/encyclopaedia-of-judaism/messiah-COM_0121>].
- Greidanus, S. 2012. *Preaching Christ from Daniel: Foundations for Expository Sermons*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Gretler, T. 2004. *Zeit und Stunde: Theologische Zeitkonzepte zwischen Erfahrung und Ideologie in den Büchern Kohelet und Daniel*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.
- Grossman, M. L. 2002. *Reading for History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Study*. Paperback. (Studies on the Texts in the Desert of Judah, vol. 45). Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Grünwaldt, K. 2006. 'שָׁלָה.' *TDOT*, vol. 15. 9-13.
- Gurney, R. M. 1980. *God in Control: An Exposition of the Prophecies of Daniel*. Worthing: H. E. Walter.
- Hamilton, V. P. 1999. 'מָעַל (mā'al),' 'מָסַח (māṣaḥ)' and 'שֹׁב (šûb).' *TWOT*. 519-520; 530-532; 909-910.
- Hammer, R. 1976. *The Book of Daniel*. (The Cambridge Bible Commentary). Cambridge, London, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Harkins, A. K. 2008. 'The Community Hymns Classification: A Proposal for Further Differentiation.' *DSD* 15:121-154.
- _____. 2011. 'The Performative Reading of the Hodayot: The Arousal of Emotions and the Exegetical Generation of Texts.' *JSP* 21/1: 55-71.
- Harman, A. M. 1997. 'כַּשֵּׁל (br),' 'כַּשֵּׁל (br).' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 2. 733-735; vol. 3. 314-316.
- Harrington, H. K. 2008. 'Keeping Outsiders Out: Impurity at Qumran.' In: García Martínez, F. & Popović, M. (eds.). *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 70). Leiden, Boston: Brill. 187-203.
- Harris, R. L. 1999. 'כַּפָּר (kāpar) I.' *TWOT*. 452-453.
- Harrison, R. K. 1969. *Introduction to the Old Testament with a Comprehensive Review of Old Testament Studies and a Special Supplement on the Apocrypha*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Hart, J. H. A. 1909. *Ecclesiasticus: The Greek Text of Codex 248 Edited with a Textual Commentary and Prolegomena*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hartley, J. E. 1999. 'יָרָה (yārâ).' *TWOT*. 403-405.
- Hartman, L.F. & Di Lella, A. 1978. *The Book of Daniel*. (The Anchor Bible). Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
- Harvey, G. A. P. 2001. *The True Israel: Uses of the Names "Jew", "Hebrew" and "Israel" in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature*. (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, vol. 35). Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Hasel, G. F. 1979. 'Daniel Survives the Critics' Den.' *Ministry* January: 8-11. [Downloaded as pdf from <<https://www.ministrymagazine.org/archive/1979/01/daniel-survives-the-critics-den>> on 28/03/2014].
- _____. 1980. 'Resurrection in the Theology of Old Testament Apocalyptic.' *ZAW* 92:267-284.
- _____. 1990. 'The Book of Daniel Confirmed by the Dead Sea Scrolls.' *JATS* 1/2:37-49.
- _____. 1993. 'The Hebrew Masculine Plural for "Weeks" in the Expression "Seventy Weeks" in Daniel 9:24.' *AUSS* 31/2:105-118.
- Hasslberger, B. 1977. *Hoffnung in der Bedrängnis: Eine Formkritische Untersuchung zu Dan 8 und 10-12*. (Münchener Universitätschriften, Fachbereich Kath. Theologie: Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament, Bd. 4). St Ottilien: EOS Verlag.
- Hebbard, A. B. 2009. *Reading Daniel as a Text in Theological Hermeneutics*. Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick Publications.

- Heger, P. 2012. *Challenges to Conventional Opinions on Qumran and Enoch Issues*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 100). Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Hempel, C. (ed.). 2010. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 90). Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Hempel, C. 2000. *The Damascus Texts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- _____. 2003a. 'Interpretative Authority in the Qumran Tradition.' *DSD* 10/1:59-80.
- _____. 2003b. 'The Community and its Rivals according to the *Community Rule* from Caves 1 and 4.' *RQ* 21/1:47-81.
- _____. 2006. 'The Literary Development of the S Tradition – A New Paradigm.' *RQ* 22:389-401.
- _____. 2007. 'The Sons of Aaron in the Dead Sea Scrolls.' In: Hilhorst, A., Puech, E. & Tigchelaar, E. (eds.). *Flores Florentino*. 207-224.
- _____. 2010. 'Shared Traditions: Points of Contact Between S and D.' in: Metso, S., Najman, H. & Schuller, E. (eds.). 2010. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Tradition and Production of Texts*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 92). Leiden, Boston: Brill. 115-131.
- Hengel, M. 1973. *Judentum und Hellenismus*. (2nd ed.). (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 10). Tübingen: JCB Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- _____. 1974. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period, vol. I*. London, SCM Press.
- Hengstenberg, E. W. 1865. *Christology of the Old Testament, and a Commentary on the Messianic Predictions, vol. 4*. (2nd ed.). (Theological Library, New Series, vol. 20). Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Hilhorst, A., Puech, E. & Tigchelaar, E. (eds.). 2007. *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. (JSJS vol. 122). Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Hill, A. E. & Matties, G. H. 1997. 'קָדִי.' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 3. 955.
- Hill, A. E. 2008. 'Daniel.' In: Longman, T. & Garland, D. E. (eds.). *The Expositor's Bible Commentary. Revised Edition, vol. 8: Daniel – Malachi*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Hogeterp, A. L. A. 2010. 'Daniel and the Qumran Daniel Cycle: Observations on 4QFour Kingdoms^{A-B} (4Q552-553).' In: Popović, M. (ed.). *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. (JSJS, vol. 141). Leiden/Boston: Brill. 173-191.
- Holm-Nielsen, S. 1960. *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran*. (Acta Theologica Danica, vol. II). Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget I.
- Holtz, G. 2009. 'Inclusivism at Qumran.' *DSD* 16/1:22-54.
- Howe, T. A. 2008. *Daniel in the Preterist's Den: A Critical Look at Preterist Interpretations of Daniel*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock.
- Hübner, H. 1972. 'Anthropologischer Dualismus in den Hodayoth?' *NTS* 18/3: 268-284.
- Hughes, J. A. 2006. *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 59). Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Hultgren, S. 2007. *From Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community. Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 66). Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Huppenbauer, H. 1957. 'רוב, רוב, רוב in der Sektenregel (1QS).' *TZ* 13:136-137.
- Ilg, N. 1978. 'Überlegungen zum Verständnis von ברית in den Qumrântexten.' In: Delcor, M. (ed.). 1978. *Qumrân: Sa Piété, sa Théologie et son Milieu*. Paris: Leuven University Press. pp
- Instone-Brewer, D. 1991. 'Mene Mene Teqel Uparsin: Daniel 5:25 in Cuneiform.' *TB* 42/2:311-16.
- Iwry, S. 1969. 'Was there a Migration to Damascus? The Problem of שבי ישראל.' *Eretz Israel* 9:80-88.
- Jaubert, A. 1958. 'Le Pays de Damas.' *RB* 65/2:214-248.
- Jefferey, A. & Kennedy, G. 1956. *The Book of Daniel: Exegesis*. In: Buttrick, G. A. et al. (eds.). *The Interpreter's Bible: The Holy Scriptures in the King James and Revised Standard Versions with*

General Articles and Introduction, Exegesis, Exposition for each Book of the Bible in Twelve Volumes, vol. 6. New York, Nashville: Abingdon.

- Jenni, E. 1997. 'אָב ('āb) father'; 'עוֹלָם ('ōlām) eternity.' *TLOT*. 1-13; 852-862.
- Jenson, P. P. 1997. 'שֶׁבַע (Sheba)'. *NIDOTTE*, vol. 4. 34-37.
- Jeremias, G. 1963. *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*. (Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, Bd. 2). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Jones, B. W. 1968. 'The Prayer in Daniel IX.' *VT* 18/4:488-493.
- Kaiser, W. C. 1999. 'מָלֵךְ (mālē)' and 'סָלַח (sālah)'. *TWOT*. 505-506; 626.
- Kapelrud, A. S. 1968. 'The Number Seven in Ugaritic Texts.' *VT* 18/4:494-499.
- Kautzsch, E. & Brown, C. R. 1884. 'The Aramaic Language.' *Hebraica* 1/2:98-115.
- Keel, O. 1998. 'Die Kultischen Massnahmen Antiochus'IV. in Jerusalem: Religionsverfolgung und/oder Reformversuch?' in: Krašovec, J. (ed.). *The Interpretation of the Bible: The International Symposium in Slovenia*. (JSOTS, vol. 289). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 217-242.
- Keil, C. F., and Delitzsch, F. 1996. *Commentary on the Old Testament*. (Electronic Version. Logos Library System). Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- Kim, A. Y. 2003. Signs of Editorial Shaping of the Hodayot Collection: A Redactional Analysis of 1QH^{a,b} and 4QH^{a,f}. (A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate School of the University of Notre Dame in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy). Notre Dame, Indiana: Graduate Program in Theology.
- Kister, M. 1999. 'Demons, Theology and Abraham's Covenant (CD 16:4-6 and Related Texts).' In: Kugler, R. A. & Schuller, E. M. (eds.). 1999. *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty. Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Sections Meetings*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholar's Press. 167-184.
- Kitchen, K. A. 1965. 'The Aramaic of Daniel.' In: Wiseman, D. J. et al. *Notes on some Problems in the Book of Daniel*. 31-79.
- Kittel, B. R. P. 1975. *The Composition of the Hodayot of Qumran*. (Graduate Theological Union, Ph.D. Religion). Ann Arbor, Michigan: Xerox University Microfilms.
- Kittel, B. P. 1981. *The Hymns of Qumran: Translation and Commentary*. Chico, California: Scholars Press.
- Kline, M. G. 1974. 'The Covenant of the Seventieth Week.' In: Skilton, J. H. (ed.). *The Law and the Prophets*. 452-469.
- Klinzing, G. 1971. *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im NT*. (Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, Bd. 7). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Knibb, M. 1987. *The Qumran Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Knibb, M. A. 1983. 'Exile in the Damascus Document.' *JSOT* 25: 99-117.
- _____. 1991. 'The Interpretation of Damascus Document VII, 9b – VIII, 2a and XIX, 5b-14.' *RQ* 15/1-2:243-251.
- Knierim, R. 1997. 'הַנְּבִיאִים.' *TLOT*. 447-448.
- Koch, J. C. 1984. *Das Buch Daniel*. (Zürcher Bibelkommentare). Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.
- Koch, K. 1997. 'מוֹעֵד'. *TDOT*, vol. 8. 167-173.
- Koenen, K. 2004. 'שָׁבַע'. *TDOT*, vol. 14. 112-128.
- Kosmala, H. 1977. 'גָּבַר (gābar)'. *TDOT*, vol. 2. 367-382.
- Kottsieper, I. 2004. 'שָׁבַע (šābar)'. *TDOT*, vol. 14. 311-336.
- Kraus, H.-J. 1988. *Psalms 1-59: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Krieg, M. 1985. 'Mô'ēd Nāqām – ein Kultdrama aus Qumran: Beobachtungen an der Kriegsrolle.' *TZ* 41:3-30.
- Kühlewein, J. 1997. 'גָּבַר (gbr) to be superior; סֵפֶר (sēper) book.' *TLOT*. 299-302; 806-813.

- Kuhrt, A. 1988. 'Babylonia from Cyrus to Xerxes.' In: *The Cambridge Ancient History*. (2nd ed.). Vol. 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 112-138. [*Cambridge Histories Online*. Accessed 24 January 2014. <<http://0-dx.doi.org.oasis.unisa.ac.za/10.1017/CHOL9780521228046.004>>].
- Kutscher, E. Y. 1957. 'Dating the Language of the Genesis Apocryphon.' *JBL* 76:288-292.
- _____ 1982. *A History of the Hebrew Language*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press/Leiden: Brill.
- La Sor, W. S., Hubbard, D. A. & Busch, F. W. 1982. *Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and Background of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Laato, A. 1990. 'The Seventy Yearweeks in the Book of Daniel.' *ZAW* 102:212-225.
- Lacocque, A. 1979. *The Book of Daniel*. (Revised ed.). London: SPCK.
- Lane, W. L. 1974. *The Gospel According to Mark: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. (New International Commentary on the New Testament). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Lange, A. 2012. 'The Textual History of the Book of Jeremiah in Light of Its Allusions and Implicit Quotations in the Qumran *Hodayot*.' In: Penner, J.; Penner, K. M.; Wassen, C. (eds.). *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature*. 251-284.
- Laperrousaz, E. M. 1986. 'Notes sur l'Évolution des Conceptions de «Guerre Sainte» dans les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte.' *RQ* 12 :271-278.
- Lebram, J. C. H. 1970. 'Apokalyptik und Hellenismus im Buche Daniel: Bemerkungen und Gedanken zu Martin Hengels Buch über „Judentum und Hellenismus.“' *VT* 20:503-524.
- _____ 1975. 'König Antiochus im Buch Daniel.' *VT* 25/4 (1975) 737-772.
- _____ 1984. *Das Buch Daniel*. (Zürcher Bibelkommentare). Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.
- Lewis, J. P. 1999. 'יָצַד (yā'ad) appoint, betrothe, assemble, meet, set.' *TWOT*. 387-389.
- Lichtenberger, H. 1995. 'Alter Bund und Neuer Bund.' *NTS* 41/3:400-414.
- LiDonnici L. R. & Lieber, A. (eds.). 2007. *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*. (JSJS vol. 119). Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Liesen, J. & Beentjes, P. C. (eds.). 2010. *Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2010: Visions of Peace and Tales of War*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- Lindenberger, J. M. 1985. 'Daniel 12:1-4.' *Interpretation* 39:181-186.
- Linington, S. 2002. 'The Term בְּרִית in the Old Testament, Part I: An Enquiry into the Meaning and Use of the Word in the Contexts of the Covenants between God and Humans in the Pentateuch.' *OTE* 15/3: 687-714.
- _____ 2003a. 'The Term בְּרִית in the Old Testament: Part II: An Enquiry into the Meaning and Use of the Word in the Prophetic Literature (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Book of the Twelve).' *OTE* 16/2:259-290.
- _____ 2003b. The Term *b^erith* (Covenant) in the Historical and Wisdom Books of the Old Testament. (MTh Dissertation for the Degree of Master in Theology, Old Testament). Pretoria: UNISA. Unpublished.
- _____ 2006a. 'The Term בְּרִית in the Old Testament, Part IV: An Enquiry into the Meaning and Use of the Word in the Books of Samuel and Kings.' *OTE* 19/1:118-143.
- _____ 2006b. 'The Term בְּרִית in the Old Testament, Part V: An Enquiry into the Meaning and Use of the Word in 1-2 Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah.' *OTE* 19/2:671-693.
- Livingston, G. H. 1999. 'הָטָא (hāṭā)'; פָּשַׁע (pāša); רָשָׁע (rāša).' *TWOT*. 277-279; 741-742; 863-864.
- Lohse, E. 1964. *Die Texte aus Qumran Hebräisch und Deutsch mit Masoretischer Punktation: Übersetzung, Einführung und Anmerkungen*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Longman, T. 1999. *Daniel*. (NIV Application Commentary). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Luc, A. 1997a. 'הָטָא (hṭ)'; 'הָלַק (hālaq).' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 2. 87-93; 160-161.
- _____ 1997b. 'עָוֹן (āwōn).' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 3. 351.

- Lucas, E. C. 2000. 'Daniel: Resolving the Enigma.' *VT* 50:1 (2000) 66-80.
- Lucas, A. J. 2010. 'Scripture Citations as an Internal Redactional Control: 1QS 5:1–20a and Its 4Q Parallels.' *DSD* 17/1:30-52.
- Lucas, E. 2002. *Daniel*. (Apollos Old Testament Commentary 20). Leicester, England; Downers Grove, Illinois: Apollos/IVP.
- Luckenbill, D. D. 1925. 'The Black Stone of Esarhaddon.' *AJSL* 41/3:165-173.
- Lurie, D. H. 1973. 'A New Interpretation of Daniel's "Sevens" and the Chronology of the Seventy "Sevens".' *JETS* 33/3:302-309.
- Lust, J. 2001. 'Cult and Sacrifice in Daniel. The Tamid and the Abomination of Desolation.' In: Collins, J. J & Flint, P. W. 2001. *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Vol. 2. 671-688.
- Machiela, D. A. 2009. *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13-17*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 79). Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Macrae, A. A. 1999. 'עֹלָם ('*ōlām*).' *TWOT*. 672-673.
- Mansoor, M. 1960. 'Studies in the New Hodayot (Thanksgiving Hymns) – V: Some Theological Doctrines.' *BR* 5:1-21.
- _____. 1961. *The Thanksgiving Hymns: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 3). Leiden: Brill.
- Martin, W. J. 1965. 'The Hebrew of Daniel.' In: Wiseman, D. J. et al. *Notes on some Problems in the Book of Daniel*. 28-30.
- Mathews, S. F. 2001. 'The Numbers in Daniel 12:11-12: Rounded Pythagorean Plane Numbers?' *CBQ* 63:630-646.
- McCarthy, D. J. 1982. 'Covenant and Law in Chronicles-Nehemiah.' *CBQ* 44/1:25-44.
- McComiskey, T. E. 1985. 'The Seventy "Weeks" of Daniel against the Background of Ancient Near Eastern Literature.' *WTJ* 47/1:18-45.
- _____. 1999. 'הַרְפָּה (*herpā*);' 'קָדַשׁ (*qādaš*).' *TWOT*. 325; 786-89.
- McConville, J. G. 1986. '1 Chronicles 28:9 - Yahweh "seeks out" Solomon.' *JTS* 37/1:105-108.
- McCready, W. O. 2011. 'The Practice of Place by the Qumran Community.' In: Flint, P. W., Duhaime, J. & Baek, K. S. (eds.). *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 287-302.
- Meadowcroft, T. J. 2001. 'Exploring the Dismal Swamp: The Identity of the Anointed One in Daniel 9:24-27.' *JBL* 120/3:429-449.
- _____. 1995. *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison*. (JSOTS 198). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- _____. 2004a. 'History and Eschatology in Tension: A Literary Response to Daniel 11:40-45 as Test Case.' *Pacifica* 17:243-250.
- _____. 2004b. 'Who are the Princes of Persia and Greece (Daniel 10)? Pointers Towards the Danielic Vision of Earth and Heaven.' *JSOT* 29/1:99-113.
- Mercer, M. K. 1989. 'Daniel 1:1 and Jehoiakim's Three Years of Servitude.' *AUSS* 27/3:179-192.
- Mertens, A. 1971. *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer*. (Stuttgarter Biblische Monographien, 12). Stuttgart: Echter KBW Verlag.
- Metso, S. 1997. *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 21). Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill.
- _____. 1998. 'The Use of Old Testament Quotations in the Qumran Community Rule.' In: Cryer F. H. & Thompson T. L. (eds.). *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*. 217-231.
- _____. 2006. 'Creating Community Halakhah.' In: Flint, P. W., Tov, E. & VanderKam, J. C. (eds.). *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*. Leiden, Boston: Brill. 279-301.

- Metso, S., Najman, H. & Schuller, E. (eds.). 2010. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 92). Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Meyer, I. 2006. 'שמם *šāmam*.' *TDOT*, vol. 15. 238-248.
- Mihalios, S. 2011. *The Danielic Eschatological Hour in the Johannine Literature*. London: T & T Clark.
- Milikowsky, C. 1982. 'Again: *Damascus* in *Damascus Document* and in Rabbinic Literature.' *RQ* 11/1:97-106.
- Millar, F. 1978. 'The Background to the Maccabean Revolution: Reflections on Martin Hengel's "Judaism and Hellenism".' *JJS* 29:1-21.
- Miller, S. R. 1994. *Daniel*. (The New American Commentary, vol. 18). Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Montgomery, J. A. 1927. *The Book of Daniel. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. (3rd impression 1959). Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Moore, M. S. 1983. 'Resurrection and Immortality: Two Motifs Navigating Confluent Theological Streams in the Old Testament (Dan 12, 1-4).' *TZ* 39:17-34.
- Moran, W. L. 1963. 'The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy.' *CBQ* 25:77-87.
- Mowinckel, S. 2005. *He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism*. (The Biblical Resource Series). Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans. (Paperback)
- Mulzac, K. 1996. 'The Remnant and the New Covenant in the Book of Jeremiah.' *AUSS* 34/2:239-248.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. 1969. 'La Genèse Littéraire de la Règle de la Communauté.' *RB* 76/4:528-549.
- _____ 1970. 'An Essene Missionary Document? CD II, 14-VI, 1.' *RB* 77:201-229.
- _____ 1971a. 'A Literary Analysis of *Damascus Document* VI, 2 - VIII, 3.' *RB* 78:210-232.
- _____ 1971b. 'The Translation of *Damascus Document* VI, 11-14.' *RQ* 7/4:553-556.
- _____ 1971c. 'The Original Text of CD 7:9-8:2 = 19:5-14.' *HThR* 64:379-386.
- _____ 1972a. 'A Literary Analysis of *Damascus Document* XIX, 33-XX, 34.' *RB* 79:544-564.
- _____ 1972b. 'The Critique of the Princes of Judah (CD VIII, 319).' *RB* 79:200-216.
- _____ 1974. 'The Essenes and their History.' *RB* 81:215-244.
- _____ 1985. 'The *Damascus Document* Revisited.' *RB* 92:223-246.
- Najman, H. 2006. 'Towards a Study of the Uses of the Concept of Wilderness in Ancient Judaism.' *DSD* 13/1:99-113.
- Naudé, J. A. 1997. 'קדש (*qdš*).' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 3 877-87.
- Nel, P. J. 1997. 'בוש (*bwš*).' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 1. 621-27.
- Newsom, C. A. 2001. 'Apocalyptic Subjects: Social construction of the Self in the Qumran *Hodayot*.' *JSP* 12/1:3-35.
- _____ 2004. *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 52). Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- _____ 2012. 'Flesh, Spirit, and the Indigenous Psychology of the *Hodayot*.' In: Penner, J.; Penner, K. M. ; Wassen, C. (eds.). *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature*. 339-354.
- Nickelsburg, G. W. E. 1972. *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. (Harvard Theological Studies 26). Cambridge: Harvard University Press/London: Oxford University Press.
- Nicole, E. 1997. 'קָהָר.' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 1. 638-642.
- Nicole, E. & Carpenter, E. 1997. 'הָתָר (*htk*).' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 2. 323.
- Nitzan, B. 1995. '4QBerakhot^{a-c} (4Q286-290): A Covenantal Ceremony in the Light of Related Texts.' *RQ* 61-65:487-506.

- _____. 2000. 'Blessings and Curses.' In: Schiffman, L. H. & VanderKam, J. C. (eds.). *Encyclopaedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Vol. 1: 95-100.
- _____. 2001. 'The Concept of the Covenant in Qumran Literature.' In: Goodblatt, D., Pinnick, A. & Schwartz, D. R. (eds.). *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 27-31 January 1999*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 37). Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill. 85-104.
- _____. 2010a. 'Education and Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls in Light of their Background in Antiquity.' In: Chazon, E. G. & Halpern-Amaru, B. (eds.). *New Perspectives on Old Texts: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 9-11 January, 2005*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 88). Leiden, Boston: Brill. 97-116.
- _____. 2010b. 'The Decalogue Pattern in the *Qumran Rule of the Community*.' In: Falk, D. K. et. al. (eds.). *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited*. 57-75.
- Olivier, J. P. J. 1997. 'סלה (*slh*).'
NIDOTTE, vol. 3. 259-264.
- Orr, A. 1956. 'The Seventy Years of Babylon.'
VT 6/3:304-306.
- Oswalt, J. N. 1997. 'משח (*mšh*).'
NIDOTTE, vol. 2. 1123-1127.
- _____. 1999. 'בוש (*bôš*)'; 'בָּהָר (*bāhar*)'; 'גָּבַר (*gābar*)'; 'כָּלָא (*kālā*)'; 'כָּלָה (*kālā*) I.'
TWOT. 97-98; 100-101; 148-149; 438; 439-440.
- Otto, E. 2004. 'שָׁבַע.'
TDOT, vol. 14. 336-367.
- Ozanne, C. G. 1965. 'Three Textual Problems in Daniel.'
JTS 16/2:445-448.
- Page, S. 2008. *Daniel*. (Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary). Macon, Georgia: Smyth & Helwys.
- Page, H. R. 1996. *The Myth of Cosmic Rebellion: A Study of its Reflexes in Ugaritic and Biblical Literature*. (VT Suppl. 65). Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill.
- Parker, J. 2012. *The War Scroll: Genre & Origin*. Mountain Home, Arizona: Borderstone.
- Parry, D. W. 1997. 'Notes on Divine Name Avoidance in Scriptural Units of the Legal Texts of Qumran.'
In: Bernstein, M, Garcia Martinez, F and Kampen, J. (eds.). *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting for Qumran Studies Cambridge 1995: Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill. 437-449.
- Parry, J. T. 2011. 'Desolation of the Temple and Messianic Enthronement in Daniel 11:36-12:3.'
JETS 54/3:485-526.
- Patterson, R. D. 1999. 'סָפַר (*sāpar*).'
TWOT. 632-634.
- Paul, S. M. et. al. (eds.). 2003. *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Payne, J. B. 1999. 'אב (*'bh*).'
TWOT. 5-6.
- Penner, J.; Penner, K. M.; Wassen, C. (eds.). 2012. *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Pfremmer de Long, K. 2012. 'Daniel and the Narrative Integrity of His Prayer in Chapter 9.' In: Mason, E. F. et al. (eds.). *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam, vol. One*. (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, vol. 153/I). Leiden, Boston: Brill. 219-249.
- Plöger, O. 1965. *Das Buch Daniel*. (Kommentar zum Alten Testament, vol. 18). Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn.
- Porteous, N. W. 1965. *Daniel. A Commentary*. London: SCM Press.
- Porter, S. E. & de Roo, J. C. R. (eds.). 2003. *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. Boston, Leiden: Brill.
- Portier-Young, A. E. 2010. 'Language of Identity and Obligation: Daniel as a Bilingual Book.'
VT 60:98-115.

- Potter, H. D. 1983. 'The New Covenant in Jeremiah XXXI 31-34.' *VT* 33/3:347-357.
- Prince, L. 1975. *Appointment in Jerusalem*. Eastbourne: Victoria.
- Pusey, E. B. 1868. *Daniel the Prophet: Nine Lectures, delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Oxford*. (2nd ed.). London, Oxford, Cambridge: Rivington/ Oxford: James Parker & Co.
- Qimron, E. 1989. 'A New Reading in 1QH XV 15 and the Root GYL in the Dead Sea Scrolls.' *RQ* 14/1:127-128.
- Rabin, C. 1958. *The Zadokite Documents: I. The Admonition. II. The Laws*. (2nd revised ed.). Oxford: Clarendon.
- Rabinowitz, I. 1954. 'A Reconsideration of "Damascus" and "390 Years" in the "Damascus" ("Zadokite") Fragments.' *JBL* 73/1:11-35.
- Raurell, F. 1993. 'The *Doxa* of the Seer in Dan-LXX 12,13.' In: Van der Woude, A. S. (ed.). *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. 520-532.
- Redditt, P. L. 1999. *Daniel*. (New Century Bible Commentary). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Regev, E. 2003. 'The *Yahad* and the Damascus Covenant: Structure, Organisation and Relationship.' *RQ* 82 (2003) 233-262.
- _____. 2007. *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. (Religion and Society, vol. 45). Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- _____. 2010. 'Between Two Sects: Differentiating the *Yahad* and the Damascus Covenant.' in: Hempel, C. (ed.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*. 431-449.
- Reimer, D. J. 1997. 'שִׁדְּקָה (*sdq*).' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 3. 744-769.
- Rendsburg, G. A. 2010. 'Qumran Hebrew (with a Trial Cut [1Qs]).' In: Schiffman, L. H. & Tzoref, S. (eds.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls at 60: Scholarly Contributions of New York University Faculty and Alumni*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 89). Leiden, Boston: Brill. 217-246.
- Rengstorff, K. H. 1964. 'ἐπτά.' *TDNT*, vol. 2. 627-635.
- Ringgren, H. 1977. 'בִּין (*bin*).' *TDOT*, vol. 2. 99-107.
- Rosscup, J. E. 1992. 'Prayer Relating to Prophecy in Daniel 9.' *TMSJ* 3/1:47-71.
- Rost, L. 1955. 'Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften: Zum „Buch der Kriege der Söhne des Lichts gegen die Söhne der Finsternis.“' *TLZ* 4:205-208.
- Routledge, R. 1995. '*Hesed* as Obligation: A Re-Examination.' *TB* 46/1:179-196.
- Rowland, C. 1982. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: SPCK.
- Rowley, H. H. 1950-51. 'The Unity of the Book of Daniel.' *HUCA* 23/1:233-273.
- _____. 1956. 'The Kittim and the Dead Sea Scrolls.' *PEQ* 88:92-109.
- Rubinstein, A. 1957. 'Notes on Some Syntactical Irregularities in Text B of the Zadokite Documents.' *VT* 7/4:356-361.
- Ryken, L., Wilhoit J. C., & Longman, T. (eds.). 1998. 'Wilderness.' *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*. 948-951.
- Sæbø, M. 1997. 'שָׁכַל.' *TLOT*. 1269-1272.
- Sanders, E. P. 1977. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Sauer, G. 1997. 'יָעַד *y'd* to appoint.' *TLOT*. 551-554.
- Schechter, S. 1910. *Documents of Jewish Sectaries, vol. I: Fragments of a Zadokite Work*. Cambridge: University Press. [Digitized version accessed on 28.05.2014 at http://www.google.co.zw/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=10&ved=0CF4QFjAJ&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.pesheroofchrist.com%2FCairo-Damascus%2520Document%2FFragments%2520of%2520a%2520Zadokite%2520work_Vol1.pdf&

[i=le2FU5bsE6j00gXlloHIBA&usg=AFQjCNEqsI5sIWlQ15ijvxg2X8YXGs92bw&sig2=7S78pyfWf5zWeyQ8Etbmg&bvm=bv.67720277,d.d2k\].](http://www.basarchive.org/oasis.unisa.ac.za/bswbBrowse.asp?PubID=BSBR&Volume=6&Issue=5&ArticleID=5&UserID=2391)

- Schiffman, L. H. 1989. *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation*. (Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, no. 38). Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- _____. 1990. 'The Significance of the Scrolls.' *BRev* 6/5:18-27 [online version accessed on 13/10/2014 at <http://0-www.basarchive.org/oasis.unisa.ac.za/bswbBrowse.asp?PubID=BSBR&Volume=6&Issue=5&ArticleID=5&UserID=2391>].
- _____. 2003. 'Utopia and Reality: Political Leadership and Organization in the Dead Sea Scrolls Community.' in: Paul, S. M. et. al. (eds.). *Emanuel*. 413-427.
- _____. 2004. 'The Concept of Covenant in the Qumran Scrolls and Rabbinic Literature.' In: Najman, H. & Newman, J. H. (eds.). *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation. Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*. (JSJS 83). Leiden, Boston: Brill. 257-278.
- _____. 2008. *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 75). Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- _____. 2010a. *Qumran and Jerusalem: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Judaism*. Grand Rapids, Michigan, Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans.
- _____. 2010b. 'From the Cairo Genizah to Qumran: The Influence of the Zadokite Fragments on the Study of the Qumran Scrolls.' In: Hempel, C. (ed.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 90). Leiden, Boston: Brill. 451-466.
- _____. 2011. 'Laws Pertaining to Women and Sexuality in the Early Stratum of the Damascus Document.' In: Roitman, A. D., Schiffman, L. H. and Tzoref, S. (eds.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008)*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 93). Leiden, Boston: Brill. 547-569.
- Schiffman, L. H., Tov, E. & VanderKam, J. C. (eds.). 2000. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum.
- Schmidt, W. H. 1997. 'אֲלֵהִים.' *TLOT*. 115-126.
- Schmiedewind, W. M. 1999. 'Qumran Hebrew as an Antilanguage.' *JBL* 118: 235-252.
- Schofield, A. 2009. *From Qumran to the Yahad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for the Community Rule*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 77). Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Schuller, E. M. & Newsom, C. A. 2012. *The Hodayot (Thanksgiving Psalms): A Study Edition of 1QH^a*. (Early Judaism and Its Literature, no. 36). Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Schuller, E. M. 1990. 'Some Observations on Blessings of God in Texts from Qumran.' In: Attridge, H. W., Collins, J. J. & Tobin, T. H. SJ. (eds.). *Of Scribes and Scrolls*. 133-143.
- Schultz, B. 2007. 'The Kittim of Assyria.' *RQ* 23:63-77.
- _____. 2009. *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered*. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, vol. 76). London, Boston: Brill.
- Schultz, C. 1999. 'אָוָּא ('āwā).'*TWOT*. 650-652.
- Schunck, K.-D. 1980. 'הִלֵּק.' *TDOT*, vol. 4. 444-447.
- Schwarz, O. J. R. 1965. *Der Erste Teil der Damaskusschrift und das Alte Testament*. Lichtland: Diest.
- Scott, I. W. 2011. 'Sectarian Truth: The Meaning of אָמָה in the *Community Rule*.' In: Flint, P. W, Duhaime, J & Baek, K S. (eds.). *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 303-343.
- Srenock, J. 2011. 'Word Order in the War Scroll (1QM) and Its Implications for Interpretation.' *DSD* 18:29-44.
- Seebass, H. (& Bergman, J. & Ringgren, H.) 1975. 'בָּחַר בָּהָר.' *TDOT*, vol. 2. 73-87. [cited as 'Seebass' since I only refer to the section written by him].

- Segal, M. H. 1965. 'The Qumran War Scroll and the Date of Its Composition.' In: Rabin, C. & Yadin, Y. *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. (Scripta Hierosolymitana, vol. 4). Jerusalem: Magnes Press; The Hebrew University. 138-143.
- Selman, M. J. 1997. 'אֹרֶר ('wr).' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 1. 324-29.
- Seow, C. L. 2003. *Daniel*. Louisville/London: Westminster John Knox.
- Shea, W. H. 1971a. 'An Unrecognized Vassal King of Babylon in the Early Achaemenid Period, I.' *AUSS* 9/1:51-67.
- _____ 1971b. 'An Unrecognized Vassal King of Babylon in the Early Achaemenid Period, II.' *AUSS* 9/2:99-128.
- _____ 1972a. 'An Unrecognized Vassal King of Babylon in the Early Achaemenid Period, III.' *AUSS* 10/1:88-117.
- _____ 1972b. 'An Unrecognized Vassal King of Babylon in the Early Achaemenid Period, IV.' *AUSS* 10/2:147-178.
- _____ 1982. 'Darius the Mede: An Update.' *AUSS* 20/3:229-247.
- _____ 1983. 'Wrestling with the Prince of Persia: A Study on Daniel 10.' *AUSS* 21/3:225-250.
- _____ 1991. 'Darius the Mede in his Persian-Babylonian Setting.' *AUSS* 29/3:235-257.
- _____ 1996. 'Nabonidus Chronicle: New Readings and the Identity of Darius the Mede.' *JATS* 7/1:1-20.
- _____ 2001. 'The Search for Darius the Mede (Concluded), or, The Time of the Answer to Daniel's Prayer and the Date of the Death of Darius the Mede.' *JATS* 12/1:97-105
- Shemesh, A. & Werman, C. 1998. 'Hidden Things and Their Revelation.' *RQ* 18/3:409-427.
- _____ 2003. 'Halakhah at Qumran: Genre and Authority.' *DSD* 10/1:104-129.
- Shemesh, A. 2002. 'Expulsion and Exclusion in the Community Rule and the Damascus Document.' *DSD* 9/1:44-74.
- Skilton, J. H. (ed.). 1974. *The Law and the Prophets: Old Testament Studies in Honor of Oswald Thompson Allis*. Nutley, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing.
- Slotki, J. J. 1951. *Daniel Ezra and Nehemiah: Hebrew Text & English Translation with an Introduction and Commentary*. (Soncino Books of the Bible.) London & Bournemouth: Soncino.
- Smith-Christopher, D. L. 1996. 'The Book of Daniel.' In: *New Interpreter's Bible. A commentary in twelve volumes. Vol. 7*. Nashville: Abingdon Press. 19-152.
- Snaith, N. H. 1944. *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament*. (1983 Paperback reprint). London, UK: Epworth Press.
- Snell, D. C. 1980. 'Why is there Aramaic in the Bible?' *JSOT* 18: 32-51.
- Soggin, J. A. 1997. 'מֶלֶךְ *melek* (king); מִשָּׁח *mšḥ* (to anoint).' *TLOT*. 672-680.
- Stahl, R. 1993. "'Eine Zeit, Zeiten und die Hälfte einer Zeit": Die Versuche der Eingrenzung der Bösen Macht im Danielbuch.' In: Van der Woude A. S. (ed.). 1993. *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologiarum Lovensianum, vol. 106). Leuven: Leuven University Press. 480-494.
- _____ 1994. *Von Weltengagement zu Weltüberwindung: Theologische Positionen im Danielbuch*. (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology, 4). Kampen: Pharos.
- Stähli, H.-P. 1997. 'עָבַר ('br) to pass by, pass over;' פָּלַל (*pll hitp.*) to pray.' *TLOT*. 832-835; 991-994.
- Stallman, R. C. 1995. 'Levi and the Levites in the Dead Sea Scrolls.' In: Charlesworth, J. H. (ed.). *Qumran Questions*. (The Biblical Seminar, vol. 36). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 164-190.
- Stauber, C. M. 2011. 'Determinism in the Rule of the Community (1QS): A New Perspective.' In: Flint, P. W, Duhaime, J & Baek, K S. (eds.). *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 345-358.
- Stegemann, H. 1971. *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde*. Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität.

- _____. 1978. 'Religionsgeschichtliche Erwägungen zu den Gottesbezeichnungen in den Qumrantexten.' In: Delcor, M. (ed.). *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa Théologie et son Milieu*. 195-217.
- Steinmann, A. 2002. 'The Chicken and the Egg: A New Proposal for the Relationship between the *Prayer of Nabonidus* and the *Book of Daniel*.' *RQ* 20/80:557-570.
- _____. 2005. 'Is the Antichrist in Daniel 11?' *BibSac* 162:195-209.
- _____. 2008. *Daniel*. (Concordia Commentary). Saint Louis: Concordia.
- Sternberger, G. 1972. 'Das Problem der Auferstehung im Alten Testament.' *Kairos* 14:273-290.
- Studel, A. 1993. 'באחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran (1).' *RQ* 62/16:225-246.
- Stevens, D. E. 2000. 'Daniel 10 and the Notion of Territorial Spirits.' *BibSac* 157:410-431.
- Stevenson, K. & Glerup, M. (eds.). 2008. *Ezekiel, Daniel*. (Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: Old Testament XIII). Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP.
- Stigers, H. G. 1999. 'שָׂדֵד (šādēq).' *TWOT*. 752-755.
- Stolz, F. 'הָלָלָה (hālā) II.' *TLOT*. 425-427.
- Stuart, M. 1850. *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Boston: Crocker & Brewster.
- Sukenik, E. 1954. 'אוצר המגילות הגנוזות : שבידי האוניברסיטה העברית' (*Otsar ha-megilot ha-genuzot : she bi-yede ha-ha-'Universitah ha-'Ivrit*). Jerusalem: Hebrew University.
- _____. 1955. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University.
- Sutcliffe, E. F. 1959. 'The First Fifteen Members of the Qumran Community: A Note on IQS 8:1ff.' *JJS* 4:134-138.
- Talmon, S. 2003. 'The Signification of אחרית הימים and אחרית הימים in the Hebrew Bible.' In: Paul, S. M. et. al. (eds.). *Emanuel*. 795-810.
- _____. 2004. 'קֶזֶס (qēs).' *TDOT*, vol. 13. 78-86.
- Tanner, J. P. 2009. 'Is Daniel's Seventy-Weeks Prophecy Messianic? Part 2.' *BibSac* 166/663:319-335.
- Thiering, B. 1963. 'Poetic Forms of the Hodayot.' *JSS* 8/2: 189-209.
- Thompson, J. A. & Martens, E. A. 1997. 'שׁוּב (šwb).' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 4. 55-59.
- Tomasino, A. 1997. 'עוֹלָם ('ōlām).' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 3. 345-51.
- Torrey, C. C. 1946. "'Medes and Persians.'" *JAOS* 66/1:1-15.
- Tov, E. 1982. 'A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls.' *HUCA* 53:11-27.
- Towner, W. S. 1984. *Daniel*. (Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching). Atlanta: John Knox.
- Treves, M. 1958. 'The Date of the War of the Sons of Light.' *VT* 8/4:419-424.
- Tromp, J. 2007. 'Damascus Document IV 10-12.' In: Hilhorst, A., Puech, E. & Tigchelaar, E. (eds.). *Flores Florentino*. 225-237.
- Ulrich, E. 1989. 'Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran, Part 2: A Preliminary Edition of 4QDan^b and 4QDan^c.' *BASOR* 274:3-26.
- _____. 1990. 'Orthography and Text in 4QDan^a and 4QDan^b and in the Received Masoretic Text.' In: Attridge, H. W., Collins, J. J. & Tobin, T. H. SJ. (eds.). *Of Scribes and Scroll*. 29-42.
- Van der Kooij, A. 1993. 'The Concept of Covenant (BERĪT) in the Book of Daniel.' In: Van der Woude A. S. (ed.). *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. 495-501.
- _____. 2011. 'The *Yahad* – What is in a Name?' *DSD* 18/2:109-128.
- Van der Ploeg, J. 1955. 'La Règle de la Guerre: Traduction et Notes.' *VT* 5/4:373-420.
- Van der Woude, A. S. 1977. 'L. H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity XVI).' (Book Review). *JSJ* 8/1:97-99.

- _____. 1993a. 'Die Doppelsprachigkeit des Buches Daniel.' In: Van der Woude, A. S. (ed.). *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. 3-12.
- _____. 1997. 'Prophetic Prediction, Political Prognostication, and Firm Belief.' In: Evans, C. A. & Talmon, S. (eds.). *The Quest for Context and Meaning*. 63-73.
- Van der Woude, A. S. (ed.). 1993. *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, vol. 106). Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Van Deventer, H. J. M. (Hans). 2012. 'Suffering, Psalms and Allusion in Daniel 9.' *OTE* 25/1:207-226.
- Van Leeuwen, C. 1997. 'רשע (rš') to be impious/guilty.' *TLOT*. 1261-1265.
- VanderKam, J. C. & Flint, P. 2002. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity*. (2004 PB edition). San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.
- VanderKam, J. C. 1994. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- _____. 2009. 'The Oath and the Community.' *DSD* 16/3:416-432.
- Vanonen, H. 2011. 'The Textual connections between 1QM 1 and the Book of Daniel.' In: von Weissenberg, H.; Pakkala, J. & Marttila, M. (eds.). *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*. (Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, vol. 419). Berlin: De Gruyter. 223-245.
- Vermes, G. 1998 [© 1997]. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. London: Penguin.
- Von der Osten-Sacken, P. 1969. *Gott und Belial: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran*. (Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, vol. 6). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Von Rad, G. 1966. 'The Joseph Narrative and Ancient Wisdom.' (Originally published in 1953). In: Von Rad, G. *The Problem of the Hexateuch and other essays*. Edinburgh, London: Oliver & Boyd. 292-300.
- _____. 1993. *Theologie des Alten Testaments. Band 2: Die Theologie der Prophetischen Überlieferung Israels*. (10th ed.). Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser/Gütersloher Verlagshaus.
- Vriezen, T. C. 1953. *Die Erwählung Israels nach dem Alten Testament*. (Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Bd. 24). Zürich: Zwingli.
- Wacholder, B. Z. 1975. 'Chronomessianism: The Timing of Messianic Movements and the Calendar of Sabbatical Cycles.' *HUCA* 46:201-218.
- _____. 1999. 'Who is the Teacher of Righteousness?' *BR* 15/2:26-29 [accessed on 06.05.2014 at: <http://0-www.basarchiv.org.oasis.unisa.ac.za/bswbSearch.asp?PubID=BSBR&Volume=15&Issue=2&ArticleID=11&UserID=2391&>].
- _____. 1999-2000. 'The Teacher of Righteousness is alive, awaiting the Messiah: האסר in CD as allusion to the Sinaitic and Damascene covenants.' *HUCA* 70-71:75-92.
- _____. 2007. *The New Damascus Document: The Midrash on the Eschatological Torah of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Reconstruction, Translation and Commentary*. (Studies on the Texts in the Desert of Judah, vol. 56). Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Wagner, M. 1997. 'רָשָׁע qēš end.' *TLOT*. 1153-1156.
- Wakely, R. 1997. 'אִסָּר ('issār); גִּבּוּר (gbr).' *NIDOTTE*, vol. 1. 473-475; 806-816.
- Walker, N. 1962. 'The Rendering of RĀŠŌN.' *JBL* 81/2:182-184.
- Wallace, R. S. 1979. *The Message of Daniel: The Lord is King*. (BST). Leicester, England/Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP.
- Waltke, B. K. 1976. 'The Date of the Book of Daniel.' *BibSac* 133:319-329.
- Walvoord, J. F. 1971. *Daniel: The Key to Prophetic Revelation*. Chicago: Moody.
- Watts, J. D. W. 1987. *Isaiah 34-66*. (Word Biblical Commentary 25). Waco, Texas: Word.
- Weber, C. P. 1997. 'חָלָל (hālā) II.' *TWOT*. 287.

- Wegner, P. D. 1999. *The Journey from Texts to Translations: The Origin and Development of the Bible*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: BakerBooks.
- Weinfeld, M. 1975. 'בְּרִית (*b^erith*).' *TDOT*, vol. 2. 253-279.
- Weise, M. 1961. *Kultzeiten und Kultischer Bundesschluss in der „Ordensregel“ vom Toten Meer*. (Studia Post-Biblica, vol. 3). Leiden: Brill.
- Weiser, A. 1962. *The Psalms: A Commentary*. Chatham, Kent: SCM.
- Weitzman, S. 2009. 'Warring against Terror: The *War Scroll* and the Mobilization of Emotion.' *JSJ* 40:213-241.
- Wenham, G. J. 1981. *Numbers: An Introduction and Commentary*. (TOTC). Leicester, England; Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP.
- Wenthe, D. O. 1998. 'The Use of the Hebrew Scriptures in 1QM.' *DSD* 5/3:290-319.
- Wesseliuss, J.-W. 2005. 'The Literary Nature of the Book of Daniel and the Linguistic Character of its Aramaic.' *AS* 3/2:341-383.
- Westermann, C. 1997. 'חֲדָשׁ (*hādāš*) new.' *TDOT*. 394-397.
- White, S. A. 1987. 'A Comparison of the "A" and "B" Manuscripts of the Damascus Document.' *RQ* 12/4:537-553.
- Whitcomb, J. C. 1979. *Darius the Mede: The Historical Chronology of Daniel*. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co.
- Wilch, J. R. 1969. *Time and Event: An Exegetical Study of the Use of 'eth in the Old Testament in comparison to Other Temporal Expressions in Clarification of the Concept of Time*. Leiden: Brill.
- Wildberger, H. 1997. 'אָמֵן (*'mn*) firm, secure;' 'בָּחַר (*bhr*) to choose.' *TLOT*. 134-157; 209-226.
- Wildgruber, R. 2013. *Daniel 10-12 als Schlüssel zum Buch*. (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2. Reihe, 58). Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck.
- Willis, J. T. 1979. 'The Expression *be'acharith hayyamin* in the Old Testament.' *Restoration Quarterly* 22/1-2:54-71.
- Wilson, G. H. 1990. 'The Prayer of Daniel 9: Reflection on Jeremiah 29.' *JSOT* 48: 91-99.
- Wise, M. 1986. 'Literary Sources for the History of Palestine and Syria: The Dead Sea Scrolls, Part 2.' *BA* 49/4:228-243.
- Wise, M. O. 2003. 'The Concept of a New Covenant in the Teacher Hymns from Qumran (1QHa X-XVII).' In: Porter, S. E. & de Roo, J. C. R. (eds.). *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. 99-128.
- Wiseman, D. J. 1965. 'Some Historical Problems in the book of Daniel.' In: Wiseman, D. J. et al. 1965. *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel*. 9-18.
- _____. 1985. *Nebuchadrezzar and Babylon: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1983*. (1991 paperback edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wiseman, D. J. et al. 1965. *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel*. London: Tyndale.
- Wood, L. 1973. *A Commentary on Daniel*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Wright, C. J. H. 2014. *The Message of Jeremiah: Grace in the End*. (BST). Nottingham, England: IVP.
- Yadin, Y. 1962. *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*. (Translated by Rabin B. & Rabin C.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yamauchi, E. 1981. 'Daniel and Contacts between the Aegean and the Near East before Alexander.' *EQ* 53:37-47.
- Yamauchi, E. 1999. 'חָנָן (*hānan*) I.' *TWOT*. 302-304.
- Young, E. J. 1949. *The Prophecy of Daniel*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans. [1980 reprint].

Zimmerli, W. 1974. 'חסד im Schrifttum von Qumran.' In: Zimmerli, W. *Studien zur Alttestamentlichen Theologie und Prophetie: Gesammelte Aufsätze, Bd. 2.* (Theologische Bücherei, Bd. 51). S.l.: Kaiser. 272-283.

Zobel, H.-J. 1986. 'חסד (*hesed*) kindness.' *TDOT*, vol. 5. 44-64.

B. Dictionaries, Encyclopaedias, Grammars and Lexicons

- Botterweck, G. J.; Ringgren, H. & Fabry, H.-J. (eds.). 1974-2006. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 15 vols. Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans. (TDOT)
- Brown, F.; Driver, S. R. & Briggs, C. A. 2000. *Enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. (Electronic Version. Logos Library System). Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems. (BDB)
- Clines, D. J. A. (ed.). 2009. *The Concise Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press. (CDCH).
- Elwell, W. A. & Comfort, P. W. (eds.). 2001. *Tyndale Bible Dictionary*. (Electronic Version. Logos Library System).. Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House. Article 'Belial, Beliar.' 157.
- Fleming, D. 1990. *Bridge Bible Directory: An A to Z of Biblical Information for the People of Today's World*. Brisbane: Bridgeway.
- Gesenius, F. W. 2003a. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. (Kautzsch E. & Cowley, S. A. E. (eds.). (2nd English ed.; Electronic Version. Logos Library System). Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems.
- _____. 2003b. *Gesenius' Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures*. (Electronic Version. Logos Library System). Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems.
- Harris, R. L.; Archer, G. L. & Waltke, B. K. 1999, c1980. *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. (Electronic Version. Logos Library System). Chicago: Moody. (TWOT)
- Holladay, W. L. & Köhler, L. 2000. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. (Electronic Version. Logos Library System) Leiden: Brill. (HALOT)
- Jenni, E. & Westermann, C. (eds.). 1997. *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. (Electronic Version. Logos Library System). Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers. (TLOT)
- Kittel, G. & Friedrich, G. (eds.). 1964. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 vols. (Translated and edited by Bromiley, G. W.; Electronic Version. Logos Library System). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans. (TDNT)
- Koehler, L. & Baumgartner, W. eds. 1958. *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*. Leiden: Brill.
- Liddell, H. 1996. *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon: Abridged from Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon*. (Electronic Version. Logos Library System). Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems.
- Lust, J., Eynikel, E. & Hauspie, K. 2003. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Revised Edition*. (Electronic Version. Logos Library System). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Ryken, L.; Wilhoit J. C. & Longman, T. (eds.). 1998. *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*. Downers Grove, Illinois/Leicester, England: IVP.
- Swanson, J. 1997. *Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Hebrew (Old Testament)*. (Electronic Version. Logos Library System). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems Inc. (Swanson)
- Tov, E. (ed.). 2005. *Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library. Version 7.0.24*. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University. (DSSEL)
- VanGemeren, W. A. (ed.). 1997. *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. 5 vols. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan. (NIDOTTE)
- Waltke, B. K. & O'Connor, M. 1990. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

Williams, R. J. 2007. *Williams' Hebrew Syntax: Revised and Expanded by John C. Beckham*. (3rd ed.). Toronto, Buffalo, London: Toronto University Press.

C. Bibles

Barker, K. (ed.). 1995. *The NIV Study Bible*. (10th Anniversary Edition). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan. (NIV)

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia: With Westminster Hebrew Morphology. 1996, ©1925; morphology ©1991. (Electronic Version. Logos Library System). Stuttgart/Glenside PA: German Bible Society/Westminster Seminary. (BHS)

Die Bibel in Heutigem Deutsch. Die Gute Nachricht des Alten und Neuen Testaments mit den Spätschriften des Alten Testaments (Deuterokanonische Schriften/Apokryphen). 1982. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. (Die Gute Nachricht)

Die Bibel nach der Übersetzung Martin Luthers. 1984 (© 1985). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. (Luther)

Die Bibel. Aus dem Grundtext übersetzt. Revidierte Elberfelder Bibel. 1987. Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus. (Elberfelder)

New American Standard Bible: 1995 update. 1995. (Electronic Version. Logos Library System). LaHabra, CA: The Lockman Foundation. (NASB)

Peterson, E. H. 2005. *The Message: The Bible in Contemporary Language*. Colorado Springs, Colorado: NavPress. (The Message)

Revised Standard Version. 1971. Oak Harbor, WA: (Electronic Version. Logos Library System). (RSV)

Ryken, L. & Ryken, P. G. (eds.). 2007. *The Literary Study Bible: ESV English Standard Version*. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway Bibles. (ESV)

Schlachter, F. E. 1981. *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten und Neuen Testaments*. Genf: Genfer Bibelgesellschaft. (Schlachter)

Tan, R. K.; De Silva, D. A. & Hoogendyk, I. 2012. *The Lexham Greek-English Interlinear Septuagint: H.B. Swete Edition*. Vol. 3. (Electronic Version. Logos Library System) (Swete)

The Holy Bible: New International Version. 1996, ©1984 (Electronic Version. Logos Library System). (NIV)

The New Jerusalem Bible: Readers Edition. 1990. London: Darton, Longman & Todd. (NJB)

The New King James Version. 1982. Nashville: Thomas Nelson. (Electronic Version. Logos Library System). (NKJV).

Thompson Studien-Bibel. Bibeltext nach der Übersetzung Martin Luthers. Altes und Neues Testament. 1984. Revidierte Fassung. Neuhausen-Stuttgart: Hänssler. (Luther)

Tyndale House Publishers. 2007. *Holy Bible: New Living Translation*. (3rd ed.) Carol Stream, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers. (NLT)

D. Ancient Sources

Josephus, F. 'Antiquities.' In: *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged*. (Translated by Whiston, W.; Electronic Version. Logos Library System). Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.

Polybius. *Histories*. English translation. (Electronic Version. Logos Library System).