Qumran Pesharim and the Pentateuch: Explicit Citation, Overt Typologies, and Implicit Interpretive Traditions

Shani Tzoref

Department of Hebrew, Biblical and Jewish Studies, University of Sydney, Room 623,
Brennan MacCallum Building, NSW 2006, Australia
shani.berrin@arts.usyd.edu.au

Abstract

Qumran *pesher* is characterized as contemporizing exegesis of poetic/prophetic biblical texts. Previous research has focused upon *pesher* exegesis of works which later canonical tradition designates as "Latter Prophets" and of the book of Psalms, the dominant base-texts in *pesharim*. The current study surveys the use of the Pentateuch in Qumran *pesher*, examining instances of explicit citation, overt Pentateuchal typology, and implicit interpretive traditions. The most noteworthy attributes that emerge are the prominence of Deuteronomy and a strong reliance upon pre-existing exegetical traditions.

Among the defining characteristics of Qumran *pesher* is the use of poetic/prophetic biblical texts as the bases for contemporizing interpretations.[1]

---

[1] My working definition of *pesher* is "a form of biblical interpretation peculiar to Qumran, in which biblical poetic/prophetic texts are applied to postbiblical historical/eschatological settings through various literary techniques in order to substantiate a theological conviction pertaining to divine reward and punishment." See S. L. Berrin, "Qumran Pesharim," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), 110–33 at 110. Some scholars oppose the inclusion of Qumran provenance as a defining feature of *pesher*, pointing to instances of similar types of exegesis in other compositions. Thus,

Most of these base-texts are taken from compositions that later canonical traditions designate as "Latter Prophets" or "Greater and Lesser Prophets," as well as from the book of Psalms.[2] The obvious significance of the Prophets and Psalms in the *pesharim* and related works has overshadowed the influence of the Pentateuch in these compositions, resulting in a gap in *pesher* research, which this study aims to fill.

It has been observed that the primary areas in which the Qumran scrolls have contributed to biblical studies are in the fields of text criticism, conceptions of canon formation, and biblical interpretation.[3] Although the Pentateuchal references in the *pesharim* are relevant to all three of these spheres, my focus here is upon biblical interpretation. I will not address issues of text criticism as I have not discerned any distinctive text-critical

---

H. Eshel, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008), 113 n. 40. For example, he points to Isa 9:13–14, as discussed by M. H. Goshen-Gottstein ("Hebrew Syntax and the History of the Biblical Text: A Pesher in the MT of Isaiah," *Textus* 8 [1973]: 100–106), and M. Kister's description of Sir 50:27–28 as a *pesher* to Deut 32:21–22 ("A Common Heritage: Biblical Interpretation at Qumran and Its Implications," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [ed. M. E. Stone and E. G. Chazon; STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998], 101–11). Notwithstanding the affinity between passages such as these and Qumran *pesher*, it remains useful to retain a distinct category, or at least a sub-category, for contemporizing Qumranic exegesis of this sort, particularly that which is marked by the use of the term "*pesher*" itself.

[2] On the view of Psalms as prophecy see especially the colophon to 11QPs^a 27:11, which states of David's numerous compositions: "all these he spoke through prophecy which was given to him from before the Most High." See, inter alia, D. Dimant, "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha at Qumran," *DSD* 1 (1994): 151–59 at 156–57; J. L. Kugel, "David the Prophet," in *Poetry and Prophecy*: *The Beginnings of a Literary Tradition* (ed. J. L. Kugel; Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), 45–55. For a comparison between the use of prophetic base-texts in pesher and the use of Prophets and Hagiographa (דברי קבלה) in the rabbinic *petira*, see Berrin, "Qumran Pesharim," 121; P. Mandel, "Midrashic Exegesis and its Precedents in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 8 (2001): 149–68 at 159. See also M. J. Bernstein and S. A. Koyfman "Interpretation of Biblical Law," in Henze, *Biblical Interpretation*, 61–87 at 73 n. 29.

[3] Thus, e.g., P. W. Flint, ed., *The Bible at Qumran. Text, Shape and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2001), as is evident from the title itself. See also Henze's introduction to *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*, 1–2.

characteristics in the Pentateuchal citations of *pesharim* as a group.[4] I will have only some passing observations to make about matters of canon, including the following preliminary remarks. Although current scholarship tends to shun the words "canon" and "biblical" with respect to scriptural texts during the Second Temple period, it fully recognizes that the Qumran *pesharim* reflect a particular subordinate stance towards certain compositions that are later incorporated into the Hebrew Bible. Within Qumran studies, there is general agreement that references to Mosaic authorship in Qumran texts are indicative of the special status attributed to those works that we now label Pentateuch. There is less agreement about the significance of designations such as "writings of the prophets" and "David" in 4QMMT. I take these as indications of a proto-canonical attitude on the part of the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls, and as sufficient justification to continue to use the term "biblical" when referring to texts later incorporated in the Hebrew Bible.[5]

––––––––––

[4] The relevant data, the textual variants from MT in Pentateuchal citations in the *pesharim*, can be found conveniently collected in the initial pages of L. Novakovic's "Text-Critical Variants in the Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents," the second appendix in J. H. Charlesworth, *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002), 130–35. Most of the variants in these citations are simply orthographic. Of particular interest, and a source of much dynamic scholarly exchange, is 4Q252 1:2 ידור, where MT reads ידון at Gen 6:3, as well as ויחתכו ימיהם rather than MT והיו ימיו in that same verse. See M. J. Bernstein, "4Q252 i 2 לעולם באדם רוחי ידור לא: Biblical Text or Biblical Interpretation?" *RevQ* 16/63 (1994): 421–27; T. H. Lim, "Biblical Quotations in the Pesharim and the Text of the Bible: Methodological Considerations," in *The Bible as Book: The Scripture at Qumran* (ed. E. D. Herbert and E. Tov; London: The British Library, 2002), 71–79; idem, *Pesharim* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 3; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 57–60; G. J. Brooke, "*E Pluribus Unum*: Textual Variety and Definitive Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. T. H. Lim et al.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2002), 107–19 at 112. Note that this variant is not represented fully accurately in Novakovic's appendix. Also, the list omits a "plus" of בשבת באחד at 4Q252 1:4, as compared to MT Gen 7:11. Note also that in the record of variants in PTSDSSP 6B, there is a typographical error in n. 19, of המשים for חמשים.

[5] Cf. E. Ulrich, "The Qumran Biblical Scrolls," in Lim, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context*, 67–87 at 85. Ulrich has been a prominent advocate for caution regarding anachronistic use of the term "canon." Nonetheless, he finds "unambiguous" evidence that by the end of the Second Temple era, there was "a

For this survey of the use of the Pentateuch in Qumran *pesher*, I have adopted the categories of Explicit Citations, Overt Typologies, and Implicit Interpretive Traditions. In the first section of this article, I catalogue the instances of explicit citation of the Pentateuch in "thematic pesharim," and observe that the selected texts tend to be poetic passages that are associated with eschatological prediction in exegetical sources outside the Qumran corpus. In the second section, we survey the re-application of proper names found in the Pentateuch to historical entities, especially groups, and the typological re-use of Pentateuchal references to designated time periods, in *pesher* compositions. The final section presents a sample of cases in which language from Torah has influenced the derivation and expression of *pesher* interpretations. The influence of Deuteronomy stands out in these implicit interpretations, reflecting the extent to which the Community viewed

---

canon-in-process, but not a canon—i.e. a collection of Sacred Scriptures largely but not completely acknowledged and agreed upon. [There was] certainly full agreement both on the fact that the Torah was canonical in the sense of *norma normans*, and on the five books that constitute the Torah; [and] virtually complete agreement by all except the Samaritans and possibly the Sadducees that the prophets was a collection of Sacred Scriptures, though the specific contents of the collection were not fixed." For the attribution of Pentateuchal texts and teachings to Moses, see e.g. CD 5:8 ("and Moses said" introduces a citation of Lev 18:13); CD 8:14–15 ("Moses said" introduces paraphrase of Deut 7:8; 9:5); 1QM 10:6 ("for this is what you said by Moses' hand" introduces a citation of Num 10:9). Cf. D. R. Schwartz, "Special People or Special Books: On Qumran and New Testament Notions of Canon," in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity* (ed. D. R. Schwartz and R. A. Clements; Leiden: Brill, 2009). For the attribution of literary works to David, see the "catalog" of Davidic compositions in 11QPsᵃ 27:11 mentioned above (n. 2). In 11Q13 2:10, a citation of Ps 82:1 is introduced by the words "as is written in the songs of David." Cf. K. Berthelot, "Les titres des livres bibliques: Le témoignage de la bibliothèque de Qumrân," in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst, É. Puech, and E. J. C. Tigchelaar; JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 127–40. There has been much discussion about the significance of 4Q397 14–21 10 in this context. I take this passage to indicate supreme authoritative status for those books attributed to Moses, which I identify as the Pentateuch. It seems to me that the passage also indicates that writings attributed to David have authoritative status and contain valuable information about future events. For differing views, see the sources cited below, n. 12.

itself as embodying the faithful penitents depicted by the Deuteronomist as meriting divine restoration.

1. Explicit Citation: Thematic pesharim

Explicit citation of a biblical text is easily recognized by the use of technical formulas, such as "as it is written."[6] As noted above, the primary base-texts in Qumran *pesher* are from prophetic works and Psalms. The main subject of this study will be the *pesher* compositions, rather than instances of "isolated *pesher*" in other compositions.[7] Of the 15 extant continuous *pesharim* from Qumran, five are commentaries upon Isaiah, seven on books of the Minor Prophets, and three on the Psalms.[8] In the compositions that have

---

[6] On citation formulas in *pesher*, see M. J. Bernstein, "Introductory Formulas for Citations and Re-citation of Biblical Verses in Qumran Pesharim," *DSD* 1 (1994): 30–70; J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the NT," in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London: Chapman, 1971), 3–58; M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (CBQMS 8; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979), 243–44; C. D. Elledge, "Appendix: A Graphic Index of Citation and Commentary Formulae in the Dead Sea Scrolls," PTSDSSP 6B, 367–77.

[7] I have limited the current investigation to compositions that employ the term "*pesher*," and focus upon those that can be considered *pesharim*. I thus do not engage in depth with the contemporizing identifying interpretations that D. Dimant has termed "isolated *pesharim*" embedded in non-*pesher* compositions, which do not include the term "*pesher*." See Dimant, "Pesharim," *ABD* 5.244–51 at 248. I am currently working on a separate study on the use of the Pentateuch in cases of isolated occurrences of the term "*pesher*" in non-pesher compositions from Qumran, in which I suggest that the use of the term in 4Q252 is related to the use of the expression פשר על to designate historical periodization in 4Q180–181 (*Pesher on the Periods*) and in 4Q464 (*Exposition on the Patriarchs*), and to the use of the term פתר in the *Damascus Document* (CD 13:8; 4Q266 9 ii 19 [restored], and 4Q267 9 iv 5, ויספר לפניהם נהיות עולם בפתריהם).

[8] This number includes the following compositions: the Isaiah *pesharim* are 4Q161, 4Q162, 4Q163, 4Q164, 4Q165; the Psalms *pesharim* are 1Q16, 4Q171, 4Q173; the *pesharim* on the Minor Prophets are 1QpHab on Habakkuk; 1Q14 on Micah; 1Q15 and 4Q170 on Zephaniah; 4Q166 and 4Q167 on Hosea; 4Q169 on Nahum. In addition to these fifteen, 3Q4 has been described as another *pesher* on Isaiah; 4Q168 has been designated as a *pesher* on Micah; and it is possible that 5Q10 (*Commentary on Malachi A*) and/or 4Q253a (*Commentary on Malachi B*)

been termed thematic *pesharim*, the Psalms and prophetic works again feature prominently, but we also find some citations and exegesis of verses from the Pentateuch.[9]

Thus, explicit references to Pentateuchal verses are absent from the extant continuous *pesharim* and they are found sparingly in the thematic *pesharim*. In the thematic *pesharim*, we find explicit citations of Pentateuchal verses in 4Q174 (*Florilegium*) and 11Q13 (*Melchizedek*) and possibly 4Q177 (*Catena A*).

The textual evidence consists of (1) base or framing texts, and (2) subsidiary supporting citations.

1.1. *Base or Framing Texts*

Some scholars have suggested that the selection of the base-texts, or framing texts, of both 4Q174 and 11Q13, is relevant to the issue of canon formation. 4Q174 is comprised of three main sections.[10] In the current reconstruction of the text, the central biblical passages in each section are,

---

may reflect remnants of continuous pesharim on Malachi. The siglum *4QUnidentified Pesharim Fragments* (4Q172) was assigned to a group of fourteen fragments, some of which have now been associated with known *pesher* manuscripts, while others may represent otherwise lost *pesher* compositions. Objections to the practice of distinguishing between "continuous" and "thematic" *pesharim* are well-taken, but the categories remain useful for our purposes. See, e.g., G. J. Brooke, "Thematic Commentaries on Prophetic Scriptures," in Henze, *Biblical Interpretation*, 134–57; J. G. Campbell. *The Exegetical Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 4; London: T&T Clark, 2004).

[9] As discussed below, 4Q174 and 11Q13 draw from a number of sources, and feature citations from the Pentateuch as well as other biblical prophetic contexts. 4Q177 relies heavily on Psalms; the extant portion of 4Q182 (*Catena B*) contains a citation of Jeremiah. Note that 4Q177 is very similar to 4Q174, and A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a.b}): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994) has proposed that they are part of a single composition. The proposal engendered much scholarly interest, but neither acceptance nor rejection. Following the physical evidence, the two manuscripts are treated separately here.

[10] For an analysis of the exegesis in this work, see G. J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985). See also his discussion in "Thematic Commentaries."

respectively, Deut 33; 2 Sam 7; and Pss 1 and 2. Emile Puech has viewed this as a deliberate sequential representation of the three sections of a tri-partite canonical corpus, Torah, Prophets, and Psalms.[11] The sequence of the composition is not certain, however. And even if one is inclined to view the textual selection as indicative of a canonical perspective, and specifically a nascent tri-partite division, it is difficult to determine what categories would be reflected in each case. Both Psalms and 2 Samuel could plausibly have been viewed as representing either "Prophets" or a third amorphous category.[12] Note that in line 7, the citation of 2 Sam 7:11 is introduced with the words "and that which he said to David." David is

---

[11] E. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, resurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le Judaïsme ancien* (EB 22; Paris: Gabalda, 1993), 573 n. 20. He points to Sir 1:24–25 ("the Law, the Prophets and the other books"), Luke 24:44 "the Law, the Prophets and Psalms," and 4QMMT C 10. For the reconstruction, cf. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie*, 129–34. On 4QMMT and the question of a tri-partite conception of a scriptural corpus, see M. J. Bernstein, "The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations," in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (ed. J. Kampen and M. J. Bernstein; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 29–51 at 49 n. 47; T. H. Lim, "The Alleged Reference to the Tripartite Division of the Hebrew Bible," *RevQ* 20/77 (2001): 23–37 at 33–34; E. C. Ulrich, "The Non-attestation of a Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT," *CBQ* 65 (2003): 202–14; K. Berthelot, "4QMMT et la question du canon de la Bible hébraïque," in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection; mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* (ed. F. García Martínez, A. Steudel, and E. Tigchelaar; STDJ 61; Leiden: Brill, 2006).

[12] Some indication of which compositions were considered prophetic works at Qumran may be obtained from citation formulas that identify the author of the quoted work as a prophet. E.g. "as is written in the words of Isaiah the son of Amos the prophet" (CD 7:10), "which is written at the hand of Zechariah the prophet" (CD B 19:7), "a]s is written in the book of Daniel the prophet" (4Q174 1–2 i 16). Cf. the convenient list of citation formulas in J. A. Fitzmyer, *To Advance the Gospel: New Testament studies* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998). Less straightforward is the assessment of the significance of formulas which do not refer to writing: "This is the word that Jeremiah spoke to Baruch" (CD 4:13), "about whom Levi son of Jacob spoke" (CD 4:15); or citations that are not attributed by name: "as he said," introducing Amos 5:26–27 in CD A 7:14–17. It may safely be concluded that the Twelve Minor Prophets was considered a work "of the prophets," in light of the citation formulas and the fact that the individual compositions were already combined in scrolls from Qumran (4QXII[a,b,c,e,g] and possibly 4QXII[f]). Cf. R. E. Fuller, *DJD* 15:221–318.

neither the author of the record of the oracle nor its direct recipient, since God spoke this to David not directly but via Nathan. The author of the composition seems more interested in the fact that the cited verse was communicated to a figure in antiquity as prophecy about the future, than in the nature of the work in which the prophecy was recorded. The selection of base-texts in 4Q174 could be taken as indicating an attempt to represent a range of types of authoritative scriptural compositions, but its significance should probably not be pushed beyond that. As noted by Miller, the base-texts in 11Q13 are also from Torah (Lev 25:13, Deut 15:2), the Prophets (Isa 52:7), and Psalms (Pss 82:1–2; 7:8–9).[13] 11Q13 is thus similar to 4Q174 in that it cites from texts "across the canon."[14] It differs, however, in that the selections from Torah are not themselves poetic/prophetic, but are legal texts instead.

The Pentateuchal base-text in 4Q174 is Deut 33, Moses' poetic blessings of the tribes of Israel prior to his death. This naturally lends itself to historicizing eschatological interpretation.[15] In 11Q13, the main Pentateuchal

---

[13] M. Miller, "The Function of Isa 61 1–2 in 11Q Melchizedek," *JBL* 88 (1969): 467–69. In 2:18, a citation of Dan 9:25b is restored. Cf. *DJD* 23:224–32. Recent studies of 11Q13 include J. S. Bergsma, *The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran: A History of Interpretation* (VTSup 115; Leiden: Brill, 2007); F. García Martínez, "The Traditions About Melchizedek in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Qumranica Minora II* (STDJ 64; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 95–108; J. C. VanderKam, "Sabbatical Chronologies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature," in Lim, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context*, 159–78. The initial publication was that of A. S. van der Woude, "Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI," *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 14 (1965): 354–73. See also J. T. Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq et Milkî-rešaʿ dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens," *JJS* 23 (1972): 95–144; P. J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchirešaʿ* (Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981), 3–23; 49–74.

[14] Some support for Puech's understanding of the selection of framing texts in 4Q174 may possibly be found in the introductory formula for the citation of Ps 82:1 in 11Q13 2:9–10, "as it is written about him in the songs of David."

[15] The text reads: "[And of Levi he said, 'Let your Thummim and Urim be with your faithful one whom you tried at Mass]ah, and (with whom) you cont[e]sted at the waters of Meribah: who sa[id'" (6–7 ll. 3–8) . . . "[of Benjamin he sai]d, 'The beloved of . . .'" (8 3). On the association between prophecy and poetry see, inter alia, S. A. Geller, "Were the Prophets Poets?" *Prooftexts* 3 (1983): 211–21; cf. Kugel, *Poetry and Prophecy*, esp. Kugel, "Poets and Prophets," 1–25, and A. Cooper,

text is Lev 25, supplemented by Deut 15:2.[16] 11Q13 utilizes biblical verses concerning jubilees and a technical financial concept of redemption, to construct a depiction of the figure of Melchizedek as a heavenly being who will serve as the redeemer (גואל) for the righteous in a future designated era. The author relies upon a pre-existing interpretive tradition that takes the final chapters of Leviticus in an eschatological sense, relating the legal institutions in ch. 25 to the covenant curses and blessings in ch. 26.[17] More

_____

"Imagining Prophecy," 26–44. On the poetic style of Deut 33, see J. Tigay, *Deuteronomy: the Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation and Commentary* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1996), Excursus 33, and the sources cited in the bibliography, 406, 547. An indication of the predictive nature of the blessings may already be found within the text itself: the use of the epithet "man of God" calls attention to Moses' prophetic role (318; 406 n. 4). Tigay states that the similarities to Gen 49 and Num 24 "reflect . . . a common fund of phrases and motifs that were traditionally used in blessings, psalms, and similar literary genres" (520). Even if these similarities do not indicate literary dependence, they will have inspired the emergence of interdependent exegetical traditions. Moses' blessings are viewed as prophetic by Josephus, *Ant.* 4.320. The blessing of Levi is also cited in 4Q175 (*Testimonia*), indicating the shared eschatological interpretation of this passage, as pertaining to a priestly messianic figure.

[16] 11Q13 2:2–6 reads "and that which he said, "*In [this] year of the Jubilee [each of you will return to his property*" (Lev 25:10). And concerning it he said "*And t]his [is the manner of the release:] let every creditor release the loan which he leaned [to his neighbor. He shall not press his neighbor or his brother for repayment because one has proclaimed a] release to G[od*" (Deut 15:2). Its interpretation for the l]atter days concerns the captives who [. . .] whose teachers [. . .] and from the *inheritance of Melchizedek*, fo[r . . .] they are the inheri[tance of Melchize]dek who will return them to them and he will proclaim to them an emancipation to release them from the [burden of] all their sins." For variants from MT Lev 25:9 at 11Q13 2:25, see *DJD* 23. The citation is different from any known version of the text, and the reconstruction presumes that the final word "land" lacks the definite article: והעברתמה שו[פר ב]כול [אר]ץ. This would be problematic, since the text would then call for the sounding of the shofar in every land, rather than throughout the land of Israel. MT reads והעברת שופר תרועה בחדש השביעי בעשור לחדש ביום הכפרים תעבירו שופר בכל ארצכם. A solution suggested by Hanan Eshel (personal communication) is to restore the word אחזתכם from Lev 25:24 (ובכל ארץ אחזתכם גאלה תתנו לארץ) at the beginning of the following column.

[17] Bergsma, *The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran*, 263, points out that 4Q463 seems to read the final chapters of Leviticus in an eschatological manner, with reference to the jubilee year and to a struggle with Belial. Cf. M. S. Smith,

specifically, it is through the implicit mediation of Isa 61:1–2 that the Pentateuchal jubilee laws can function as biblical precedents for eschatological predictions.[18] Thus, it has been observed that although neither Lev 25:10 nor Isa 61:1–2 is explicitly cited in 11Q13, the rare word דרור in 11Q13 2:6 originates from these verses. Similarly, שבויים in 11Q13 2:4 derives from Isa 61:1;[19] שנת רצון in 2:9 derives from Isa 61:2;[20] נקם in 2:13 reflects Isa 61:2; the restoration of משיח הרו[ח in 2:18 reflects Isa 61:1.

A word about the use of the term "*pesher*" is in order at this juncture.[21] One of our criteria for defining *pesher* compositions is the use of the word

---

DJD 19:211–14. Bergsma sees a similar eschatological exegesis of Lev 25 in 6Q12, following Baillet's reconstruction in *DJD* 3:126. Regarding 4Q383–391, Bergsma proposes that *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* re-worked Dan 9 so as to depict Jeremiah as having foreseen the delayed fulfillment of the covenant curses in Lev 26 during the Second Temple period (277).

[18] There is disagreement as to whether Lev 25 or Isa 61 is to be considered the primary base-text in this work. Miller stated that although Isa 61:1–2 is never explicitly quoted in the extant text, it "stands behind our document and appears in the form of Stichwörter at crucial points" ("The Function of Isa 61 1–2," 467), and, "while 11Q13 is therefore not in *structure* [original italics] a *pesher* or midrash on Isa 61:1–2, it is as if it were telescoped in those verses" (469). On the inner-biblical exegetical development, the use of Lev 25 in Isa 61, see the summary of "Jubilees in the Prophets," in Bergsma, *The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran*, 2–3, 12–13. He cites W. Zimmerli, "Das Gnadenjahr des Herrn," in *Archäologie und Altes Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1970), 321–32; B. D. Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1997), 140–42, 328. Bergsma discusses the eschatological "corporate re-application" of Lev 25 in Isa 61 (and elsewhere in Isa 40–66, as well as in Ezek 40–48), and the move in Isa 61 to see the "redeemer" of Lev 25 as a "'messianic' (anointed) figure, who will proclaim and inaugurate a new age characterized by the freedom and restoration of the jubilee year" (198–203). On the same combination of Isa 61:1–2 with Lev 25:9–13 in the Gospel of Luke, cf. G. J. Brooke, "Shared Intertextual Interpretations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," in Stone and Chazon, *Biblical Perspectives*, 35–57.

[19] There may also be wordplay with this root in the verb ישיבמה in line 6, as suggested by VanderKam, "Sabbatical Chronologies," 171.

[20] In my opinion, the elevation of this term in Isa 61 itself derives from the unusual uses of the root רצה in Lev 26:34 (והרצת), and 26:41, 43 (ירצו את עונם). In addition to the shared terms adopted by 11Q13, we also find an echo of the key terms קום and שמם from Lev 26 in Isa 61:4 שממות ראשנים יקוממו.

[21] The extant citations from Deuteronomy in 4Q174 seem to lack not only

"*pesher*" in formulas associated with explicit citations. However, these compositions do not use the term in every instance of interpretation. At times, alternative formulas are employed, such as simple pronominal identifications in continuous *pesharim* (e.g. "they are the Kittim"). It has been observed that a form of the word "*pesher*" appears in 4Q174 only in the comments to Psalms, but is not found in the comments to 2 Sam 7, or to Deuteronomy.[22] In 4Q177 the word is preserved twice, once following a citation of Ps 13:2–3 (4Q177 10–11 9), and once where the lemma is unclear, but may be Ps 17:1 (4Q177 1–4 6). It is also plausibly restored in line 14, introducing a comment upon a reference to Ezekiel, probably a modified citation of Ezek 25:8b. There are two preserved occurrences of the word "*pesher*" in 11Q13, and these follow citations of Psalms (Ps 7:8b–9a in 11Q13 2:12) and Isaiah (Isa 52:7 in line 17).[23] The term has been restored in line 4, following the quote from Deuteronomy. If the restoration is accurate, as seems likely, this would be one of only two extant occurrences, along with 4Q252 (*Commentary on Genesis A*), in which a formula including the word "*pesher*" is used for an explicit Pentateuchal

---

pesher formulas, but also introductory formulas. However, this is best understood as a simple stylistic consequence of the fact that the three citations themselves begin with the phrase "And of [x] he said." That is, "And of Levi he said," restored in 6–7 3; "Benjamin" restored in 8 3. And, in frags. 9–10 line 3, "And of Gad he sa[id . . .]." Contrast "as it is written in the book of [Moses]," introducing Exod 15:17–18, in frags. 1–2, 21 ll. 2–3. In 11Q13, citation formulas do precede the Pentateuchal quotations of Lev 25:13 in 2:2 and Lev 25:9 in 2:25, and a formula is restored prior to the citation of Deut 15:2 in 2:2–4.

[22] The word is clearly absent from the commentary to Samuel; the section on Deuteronomy is not sufficiently preserved to determine with certainty whether the formula is absent.

[23] In 11Q13 2:12, the formula immediately follows the citation of Ps 82:2 in 2:11, but this is actually part of a compound citation, beginning with Ps 82:1 in line 10, and interrupted by Ps 7:8b–9a in 2:10–11. In 2:17, the formula follows the citation of Isa 52:7 in 2:16. The latter identifies elements in the citation "'the mountain[s' are] the prophet[s] . . . and 'the messenger' i[s . . .]"; but the former seems to address the subject matter of the compound citation as a whole: "its interpretation concerns Belial and concerns the spirits of his lot . . . And Melchizedek will exercise the veng[ea]nce." 11Q13 2:15 reads "It (is) the day of [peace" without a clear referent; presumably, this refers to the day on which Melchizedek will preside and judge. It is possible that a citation of Isa 61 preceded the quotations from Leviticus and Deuteronomy.

citation.[24] The distribution of the term "*pesher*" in the Qumran *pesharim* may reflect some canonical perspective, such that, consciously or unconsciously, pesherists tended to restrict the use of the term to citations from prophets and Psalms."[25] Among the "isolated pesharim" identified in non-*pesher* compositions by Dimant, specifically in CD and 1QS, only the interpretation of Isa 24:17 at CD 4:13–19 contains the word *pesher* (specifically, פשרו in l. 14). The word is not found in the *pesher*-like interpretations of Pentateuchal texts found in this document, at CD 6:3–11; CD A 7:10–21; CD A 8:8–12 and its parallel CD B 19:21–24. This observation can not be given too much weight, however, since the word is also absent in the *pesher*-like interpretations of citations of prophetic texts in CD.[26]

---

[24] Although Milik disagreed with this reconstruction, his alternative proposal also includes the word "*pesher*." Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq et Milkî-rešaʿ," 124–25; E. Puech, "Notes sur le manuscrit de XIQMelkisédeq," *RevQ* 12/48 (1987): 483–513 at 510–11. There is one other work in which the word "*pesher*" seems to follow a Pentateuchal reference, but my investigation has not yet shed any new light on 4Q159 (*Ordinances*). This is not a *pesher* composition, but has been described as a "medley of laws" like 4Q265 (J. M. Baumgarten, *DJD* 35:58–59). In the relevant fragment, frag. 5, the subject matter is narrative. The central text has been identified as Exod 33:7, in which Moses pitches the tent outside the camp. The word *pesher* in line 1 follows upon the words אל וימותו ○[, which does not correspond to any known text; Strugnell proposed taking this as a variant citation of Lev 16:1. Again, the formula "*pesher hadavar*" in line 5 follows upon the words ו[יצאו שמה which does not correspond to any known biblical text. M. J. Bernstein suggests that perhaps what is "being '*peshered*'" here is a 'historical event' rather than a text" ("4Q159 Fragment 5 and the 'Desert Theology' of the Qumran Sect," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* [ed. S. M. Paul et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003], 53 n. 29).

[25] In considering the absence of the term *pesher* in the comments to 2 Samuel, Brooke describes Nathan's oracle as "no different than the sayings of Habakkuk and Nahum" ("Thematic Commentaries," 147). It may be relevant, however, that this prophecy appears in a book of the Bible that we would label as historical narrative rather than prophecy. As noted above, the introductory formula for the oracle in the *pesher* does not name Nathan, but rather states "and that which He said to David."

[26] Ezek 44:15 (CD 3:20–4:4), Isa 24:17 (CD 4:13–19), Zech 11:11 and Ezek 9:4 (CD B 19:7–13), and Isa 40:3 (1QS 8:14–16, 9:19–20). In the other cases of explicit citation of the Pentateuch in CD, the quotations are for purposes other than *pesher*-like identifying interpretation; thus, for example, legal proof-texts such as CD 5:2 (introduced by "of the prince it is written"), 5:8 ("Moses said").

1.2. *Subsidiary Citations*

In addition to the use of biblical verses as base-texts, the thematic *pesharim* also feature subsidiary citations, included within interpretive comments. As we would expect, most secondary citations are from books of the prophets, but there are some explicit quotations of Pentateuchal verses too.[27] Again, reliance upon interpretive traditions is evident in the selection of these secondary proof-texts. As we have noted, 11Q13 cites Deut 15:2 in its interpretation of Lev 25:13. This usage depends upon an exegetical leap, identifying the year of release in Deut 15 with the sabbatical cycles in Leviticus.[28]

4Q174 includes an explicit citation of Exod 15:17–18 within its interpretation of 2 Sam 7:10–11. The quotation reads "The sanctuary], Lord, which Your hands have fashioned. The Lord will reign forever and ever. It is introduced with the formula, "as it is written in the Book of [Moses]" (4Q174 1–2 3). This verse, from the Song of the Sea, is clearly poetic, and thus appropriately viewed as prophetic. It is cited in order to bolster the assertion that the Temple that will be rebuilt in fulfillment of 2 Samuel will

---

[27] In 4Q174, the citations of the prophets include Isa 8:11, 65:22–23; Ezek 37:23/ 44:10; Amos 9:11. There is also a citation of Dan 11:32 [/12:10]. In another thematic *pesher*, 4Q177, the extant citations are primarily from Psalms. In this work, as in 4Q174, the word "*pesher*" only appears in formulas for Psalms citations (at 4Q177 1–4 6, following a citation of Ps 17:1a, and at 10–11 9, following Ps 13:5a), though other subsidiary biblical sources are cited throughout the comments upon the framing base-texts. The base-texts are Pss 6, 11, 12, 13, 16, and 17. In most cases, it is the initial verses of the psalm that are cited, similar to the situation for the citations from Pss 1 and 2 in 4Q174. In Steudel's reconstruction, the sequence of the base-texts follows the familiar order of Psalms, other than Ps 6 which appears out of order in col. 11. Ps 11:1–2 (at 4Q177 I 7–9); Ps 12:1 (at I 12); Ps 13: 2–3 (at II 8–9); Ps 16:3; Ps 17:1 (at III 4); Ps 6:2–5 (at IV 7–8). The extant text includes citations of Isa 22:13, 32:7, 35:10 (=51:11), 37:30; Jer 18:18, Hos 5:8, Nah 2:11, Zech 3:9; and Ezek 25:8 (in a form variant to MT, but similar to LXX, in containing the word "Israel" as well as "Judah").

[28] I view this citation as "supplementary," since it follows immediately upon the citation of Lev 25:13; if the current manner of restoring the identification formula is correct, then it might be considered a base-text instead, or as well, since the term "*pesher*" is used in its identification. It is also possible that the *pesher* formula may be applied to both citations as a unit, or might refer back to the citation of Lev 25:13.

be an eternal Temple established by God.[29] Although I have not found evidence of extensive exegetical traditions for this verse in early Jewish writings, there is early evidence for the belief that God would personally rebuild the eschatological Temple.[30]

The citation of Exodus in 4Q174 is immediately followed by a paraphrase of Deut 23:3–4, regarding the exclusivity of Temple precincts (underlined in the following citation of 4Q177 1–2 3–4):

> "*[And no] enemy will oppress him an]ymore, [and no] son of deceit [shall afflict] him [agai]n, as formerly from the day that I appointed judges] over my people Israel*" (2 Sam 7:10–11a). This is the house which [he will build] for [him] in the latter days, as it is written in the book of

---

[29] The mention of divine kingship is also relevant. The subject of Nathan's oracle is the firm establishment of two houses: the Davidic dynasty, and the Temple. The verse in Exodus is employed to affirm divine rule and the permanence of the divinely built Temple anticipated by the author. Cf. Brooke, *Exegesis*, 178–79. The affirmation of Davidic leadership is also found in the text, with respect to the eschatological leader, the "Shoot of David" who will arise in the end of days, along with the Interpreter of the Torah, "to save Israel."

[30] See D. Flusser, "Two Notes on the Midrash on 2 Sam vii," *IEJ* 9 (1959): 99–109 (repr. in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* [Jerusalem: Magnes, 1998], 88–98), who refers to *1 En.* 90 and Mark 14:58. F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts From Qumran* (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 202–13, discusses the expression of this tradition in 11QTᵃ 29:7–10 and in the New Jerusalem texts from Qumran. Some rabbinic texts associating Exod 15:17–18 with the heavenly temple and future eschatological Temple are discussed by V. Aptowitzer, "The Heavenly Temple in the Agada," *Tarbiz* 2 (1931–32): 137–53, 257–87. I am thankful to Alex Jassen for directing my attention to this publication. Cf. *Gen. Rab.*, 137 and *Mek. Rab. Ishmael* (מס' דשירה פרשה י ד"ה תביאמו ותטעמו); the idea continues to be articulated more clearly in later sources, including the commentaries of Rashi (on *b. Roš. Haš.* 30a) and Tosafot (on *b. Šebu.* 15b). The most similar exegetical use of Exod 15:17 to that in 4Q174 can be found in Midrash Vayosha: "When Moses saw God's love for Israel, he said before him, 'Master of the Universe, "bring them and plant them" and that planting will be a planting that will not be uprooted forever, and bring Jerusalem down from heaven and do not destroy her forever, and gather in the exiles of Israel into her midst and they will dwell there securely.' Therefore it is said, 'You will bring them in and plant them in the mountain of your inheritance, in the place you made for your residence, O Lord, the sanctuary, O Lord, that your hands have established'" (transl. A. Jellinek, *Bet Hamidrash* [Jerusalem: Bamberger and Wahrmann, 1938], 55).

> [Moses, "*the sanctuary], O Lord, which Your hands established. The Lord will reign for ever and ever*" (Exod 15:17–18). This is the house which these will not enter [. . . for]ever nor an <u>*Ammonite, a Moabite, a bastard*</u>, a foreigner, or a proselyte <u>*forever*</u> (cf. Deut 23:3–4), for his holy ones are there. [His glory shall] be revealed for[ev]er; it shall appear over it perpetually. And strangers shall lay it waste no more, as they formerly laid waste the sanctua[ry of I]srael because of their sin. And he has commanded a sanctuary of human(s) to be built for him, so that they may offer incense in it to him, before him, works of Torah.

This is not precisely an explicit biblical citation inasmuch as it is neither preceded nor followed by a standard citation formula. It is, however, preceded by an identifying phrase with the relative particle אשר ("this is the house which" [l. 3]), which recapitulates the beginning of the formula preceding the citation of Exodus ("This is the house which [he will build] for [him] in the latter days, as it is written in the book of [Moses]"). Just as 11Q13 relied upon eschatological interpretive traditions in its use of Pentateuchal verses about the laws of jubilees, 4Q174 reflects established exegetical traditions in its employment of a Pentateuchal law about the Temple for an eschatological interpretation. The precise nature of the relevant traditions and the function of the citation of Deuteronomy are the subjects of some debate. Along with George Brooke, I take the citation as a vehicle for emphasizing both the exclusive nature of the future sanctuary and its inviolability.[31] This exclusivity seems to be the subject of this *pesher*

---

[31] *Exegesis at Qumran*, 178–94. This same double exegesis of Deut 23:2–4 has been attributed to 4QMMT by E. Qimron (B 39–41 in *DJD* 10:158–59). Bernstein suggests that it might be more appropriate to understand the text as reflecting a single interpretation, pertaining to marriage alone ("Employment and Interpretation," 38). Brooke observes a three-fold description of the eschatological Temple as exclusive, inviolable, and a sanctuary of righteous men. (For the concept of community as Temple, see also 1QS 8:4–7). Cf. the nuanced discussion of D. Dimant, "4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple," in *Hellenica et Judaica: Hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky* [ed. A. Caquot, M. Hadas-Lebel, and J. Riaud; Leuven: Peeters, 1986], 165–89. Despite the inclusion of "*mamzer*" and "*ger*" in the citation, it seems likely that the point of the quotation in 4Q174 is specifically the exclusion of the Gentiles, and that the author is not only concerned with the purity of the Temple in the eschatological era, but also with its inviolability. Line 5 paraphrases the Exodus citation: "[His glory shall] be revealed for[ev]er; it shall appear over it perpetually," and then proceeds to "And

in 4Q174, with respect to Deut 23:3–4, and also of a *pesher* in 4Q177. 4Q177 appears to employ Deut 7:15 to communicate a similar message of excluding disabled individuals from the sanctuary. 4Q177 1–4, 14, 24 and 31, line 2, reads והסיר ה'] ממכה כול חלי ("and God will remove] from you all sickness" (Deut 7:15a), followed by a citation of Ps 16:3 לקדושים אשר בארץ המה ואדירי כל חפצי בם ("To the ho[ly ones that] are in the la[nd] and my nobles in [whom] is all my delight[." The context is too fragmentary to offer any certain information beyond the identification of the biblical source. However, the juxtaposition with "the holy ones" may point to a concern with matters pertaining to inclusion and exclusion on the basis of physical deformities. A number of Qumran texts indicate that certain limitations upon disabled individuals were prompted by concern for maintaining appropriate levels of holiness in the presence of angels. This example may be added to those adduced by Anke Dorman in her recent monograph.[32]

In sum, 4Q174 includes a series of citations from Deut 33 that function as base-text for *pesher*-type interpretation, but without the word "*pesher*"; it includes a subsidiary citation from Exod 15 preceded by an

—————————

strangers shall lay it waste no more, as they formerly laid waste the sanctua[ry of I]srael because of their sin." The susceptibility of the Temple to foreign invasion is a theme found in 4QpNah, 1QpHab, 4QpIsa, as well as elsewhere in Second Temple literature, e.g., *Psalms of Solomon*.

[32] See esp. 1QSa 2:5–8; 1QM 7:4–6; 4Q266 8 i 5–9. Cf. J. H. W. Dorman, *The Blemished Body: Deformity and Disability in the Qumran Scrolls* (Groningen: Rijksuniversiteit, 2007); the exclusion from the presence of holy angels is addressed especially in ch. 3, summarized on 134–35. See also A. Shemesh, " 'The Holy Angels are in Their Council': The Exclusion of Deformed Persons from Holy Places in Qumranic and Rabbinic Literature," in *DSD* 4 (1997): 178–206. There may also be a wordplay in operation in this *pesher*, between חלי illness and חלל defilement; Lev 21:23 states that disabled and deformed priests cannot enter the sanctuary so as to avoid defiling the sancta (לא יחלל את מקדשי). 4Q177 may be stating that God will remove unworthy individuals from the Community so that they do not defile his holy ones. However, this understanding of the function of the citation is not certain. The verse in its original context refers to the removal of sickness, and that is likely to be the meaning in the *pesher* as well. In fact, because of the fragmentary state of the initial lines of col. iii, it is not even clear that the words "from you all sickness" are part of an explicit citation; "אשר יאמר could possibly be referring to the preceding words "praises of glory," rather than introducing a subsequent phrase, although the collocation of שבח and אמר would not be characteristic of the Hebrew of this period.

identifying formula and citation formula, but without the word "*pesher*"; and it includes a paraphrase of verses from a legal context in Deut 23, preceded by an abbreviated identifying formula which seems to flag the biblical reference as a legal prooftext. 11Q13 cites from Lev 25:9 and 13 and Deut 15:2, with citation formulas, and probably contains the word *pesher* in one of its identifying formulas. It also exhibits dependence upon Lev 25:10, though the verse does not appear in the extant text.

In each of these cases, there is evidence of independent exegetical traditions associating the Pentateuchal passages with eschatological events. The poetic last blessings of Moses and the Song of the Sea lend themselves most obviously to *pesher* interpretation. The laws of jubilee years were already re-framed eschatologically within the Hebrew Bible, in Isa 61, which has left its mark on 11Q13. We have discerned a possibly broad exegetical tradition in the citations of Deuteronomy in 4Q174 and 4Q177 as pertaining to the exclusiveness of the Temple and eschatological community.

These observations about *pesher* interpretations of Pentateuchal texts in the thematic *pesharim* point to similarities with characteristics of the Pentateuchal citations in the "isolated *pesharim*" in CD: CD 6:3–11 (on Num 21:18 along with Isa 54:16); CD A 7:10–21 (on Num 24:7 with Isa 7:17 and Amos 9:11); CD A 8:8–12, CD B 19:21–24 (on Deut 32:33). As Dimant has noted, in all three of these instances of *pesher*-like interpretation of Pentateuchal texts in CD, the quoted texts are "ancient songs," and as such were considered prophetic.[33] In two of the cases, the interpretation in CD may clearly be shown to reflect wider exegetical traditions associated with the verse.[34] In two of the three cases, as in the citation of

---

[33] Dimant, "Pesharim," 248.

[34] On the use of the image of provision of water in Num 21:8 to represent the dissemination of interpretations and teaching of Torah, see A. Shemesh and C. Werman, "Hidden Things and Their Revelation," *RevQ* 18/71 (1998): 409–27 at 418–21; M. Kister, "A Common Heritage," 109–10; M. Fishbane, "The Well of Living Water: A Biblical Motif and its Ancient Transformations," in *Shaʿarei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (ed. M. Fishbane and E. Tov; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 3–16. On the hermeneutics of the interpretation of this passage in CD, see N. Mizrahi, "'The Well is the Law': A Semantic Note on the Interpretation of Num 21:18 in CDᵃ 6:2–9" (forthcoming). On traditions associating the "star" and "staff" of Num 24:17 with eschatological leaders, see the sources cited by C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1958), 30 n. 3 (including Targums and *T. Levi* 18:3; in application to Jesus, e.g. in Rev 22:16; and to Bar Kochba in *y.*

Leviticus in 11Q13, and similarly to the citation of Exodus in 4Q174, the interpretation of the Pentateuchal verse is part of a composite exegesis that also employs text from a prophetic book.

From the extant data, we may thus observe the following tendencies among *pesher* interpretations of Pentateuch in thematic *pesharim* and in isolated *pesharim*: the citations tend to be poetic texts; the term *pesher* is generally absent; the passages tend to involve composite interpretation with a text from a prophetic work; and the interpretations tend to reflect broader exegetical traditions.

2. Overt Typologies

Dependence upon exegetical traditions is also evident in the typological employment of Pentateuchal terminology in the *pesharim*. By "overt typologies" I refer to the adoption and adaptation of biblical language, particularly epithets, for polemical sectarian purposes. A notable characteristic of Qumran *pesher* is the use of sobriquets, biblically derived epithets to refer to contemporary figures. The influence of the Pentateuch is especially prominent in sobriquets involving proper names, and is also evident in the designation of periods of time.[35]

Taʿan. 4:2, 67d and Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 4:6), and see below, n. 50. The evidence for eschatological traditions associated with Deut 32:33 are not as strong as for the previous two cases, but echoes of such exegesis might be found in *T. Ash.* 7 (cited by Rabin, 34). In *Testament of Asher*, as in Ezek 29:3 and *Pss. Sol.* 2:29 (also cited by Rabin) this verse is associated with God's vengeance against the enemies of Israel; so too, *Tg. Onq.* renders יינם as כס פורענותהון. In CD, the focus is upon the wickedness of the sinners within Israel. Nonetheless, *T. Ash.* 7:1 does align with CD in applying Deut 32:32 to the sinful ways of Israel: "Become not, my children, as Sodom." See Beale's discussion of "The Metaphorical Associations of Serpents and Scorpions in Judaism," in G. K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999), 515–17.

[35] I have not noticed any place-names with specifically Pentateuchal origins. "Lebanon" appears in Torah, but the usage in Qumran *pesher* seems to depend upon traditions deriving from occurrences of the term in the prophetic works. See G. Vermes, in *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (Leiden, Brill, 1961), 26–43; and H. F. D. Sparks, "The Symbolical Interpretation of Lebanon in the Fathers," *JTS* NS 10 (1959): 264–79. A different sort of typological use of the Pentateuch is found in 4Q252 3:2–6, which employs terminology from the law of the idolatrous

2.1. *Times*

One of the most significant terms in *pesher* is the phrase אחרית הימים, which appears frequently in the *pesharim*, often as part of the identifying *pesher* formula.[36] The term is found in the Pentateuch in Gen 49:1; Num 24:14; Deut 4:30 and 31:29. As noted above, Gen 49 and Num 24 were considered prophetic/eschatological in early exegetical sources. The seminal study of the meaning of אחרית הימים in the Qumran corpus is that of Annette Steudel.[37] She demonstrates that the term is variously used in the scrolls to reflect times past, present, and future from the perspective of the author. She concludes that the idiom designates "a limited period of time, that is the last of [the] series of divinely pre-planned periods into which history is divided . . . [the] last period of time directly before the time of salvation." Although there is no consensus regarding the meaning(s) of the term in the Hebrew Bible, it is clear that during the Second Temple era, the idiom came to connote the final era leading up to Divine Judgment and salvation of the Elect, which, for the Qumran Community, meant their own time.

Another appropriation of a Pentateuchal time-span is the "40 year" period mentioned in 4Q171 (4QpPsᵃ) 1–2 ii 7–8.[38] The forty years of Israelite wandering in the desert between the Exodus and the arrival into the Land of Israel (Num 14:33–34) served as a model for the Community's perception of a forty-year era of punishment immediately preceding the final salvation.

---

city in Deut 13:13–19 in commenting upon the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 19). Cf. G. J. Brooke, *DJD* 22:202–3.

[36] Cf. the list of "Formulae containing the Phrase אחרית הימים," in Elledge, "Appendix," 376.

[37] A. Steudel, "אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran," *RevQ* 16/62 (1993): 225–46. Note, however, Talmon's objections to the tendency among Qumran scholars to view the term as eschatological in every instance, rather than "real-historical," in "The Signification of אחרית and אחרית הימים in the Hebrew Bible," in Paul et al., *Emanuel*, 795–810. Talmon points to 4Q252, which seems to locate Saul in the latter days relative to Moses. 4QMMT may also be understood as regarding events of the monarchic period as "latter day" fulfillments of biblical predictions (MMT C 20–26. Cf. Berthelot, "4QMMT et la question," 3–5).

[38] "A little while (ועוד מעט) and the wicked will be no more. *vac* I will stare at his place and he will no longer be there."

This is also the number given in CD 20:13–15 for the period of divine Wrath: "And from the day of the gathering in of the unique teacher until the end of all the men of war who turned back with the man of lies, there shall be about forty years." In the historical overview in CD 3:6–9, the basis for this typology is made clear—the disobedience of the generation of the wilderness incurred divine wrath, and led to the excision (*karet*) of the male population. A typological adaptation of the forty-year sojourn may already be evident in Ezek 4:6 and 20:32–39.[39]

We have already noted the re-casting of jubilee years in 11Q13, the exegetical tradition that transformed the practical laws of Lev 25 into a schematization culminating in eschatological liberation. Gary Anderson has shown how the development of this tradition reflects conceptual-linguistic associations of sin with debt.[40] It is likely that such a conception also underlies the use of phrases referring to a time of "visitation": עת פקדת הארץ in 4Q162 (4QpIsa[b]) 2:2 and 4Q166 (4QpHos[a]) 1:10. דור הפקודה [41] The expression probably derives from Lev 18:25, ותטמא הארץ ואפקד עונה עליה ותקא הארץ את ישביה.

2.2. *People*

The *pesharim* frequently employ biblically-derived sobriquets for contemporary individuals and groups, representing the Community itself and their opponents. These epithets are not specific to the *pesharim*, but are also found in other sectarian Qumran texts. In fact, the use of these sobriquets is a key identifying marker of sectarian compositions at Qumran.[42]

---

[39] See M. Brady, "Biblical Interpretation in 4Q383–391," in Henze, *Biblical Interpretation*, 103. The 40 year period follows upon the 390 years of exile. For the typological usage in CD, see H. Eshel, "The Meaning and Significance of CD 20: 13–15," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill 1999), 331–36.

[40] "From Israel's Burden to Israel's Debt: Towards a Theology of Sin in Biblical and Early Second Temple Sources" in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (ed. E. G. Chazon, D. Dimant, and R. A. Clements; STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 1–30.

[41] See also, inter alia, 1QS 3:14,18; 4:18–19, 26; and CD A 7:21; B 19:10, 11; 4Q266 1 a-b, 2.

[42] The matter is addressed by Davila in "The Pesharim" (Summary of a lecture

Many of these epithets rely upon wordplay and complex exegesis, frequently of more than one verse in the prophetic corpus. This is the case, for example, for the terms Teacher of Righteousness, Spouter of Lies, Lion of Wrath, and Seekers-after-Smooth-Things (דורשי החלקות).[43]

Epithets rooted in the Pentateuch tend to be somewhat more basic, though they still evince sectarian re-workings of existing interpretive traditions. The term "Judah" may sometimes refer to the Community and sometimes to their opponents. In either case, though, Judah represents contemporary Jewry, as follows logically from the Pentateuch. The reason for the variable referents is that, although the Community recognized the Jewish identity of the Jerusalem establishment, and of the general population of Judea, it viewed itself as the true representative of Judaism.[44] "Ephraim" is generally understood to refer to the Pharisaic opponents of the Community. It is possible that wordplay contributed to this identification, but the basic rationale is the rejection of the Northern tribes of Israel, as represented by Ephraim, in the Hebrew Bible. Elsewhere, I have suggested that this may be an appropriation of anti-Samaritan polemic.[45] The reference to "Manasseh" in 4Q169 (4QpNah) is generally understood as referring to the Sadducees and/or the supporters of Aristobulus II against

----

by J. R. Davila on 22 February 2005, available online at http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/~www_sd/pesharim.html).

[43] The epithet *Moreh (Ha)Tzedeq* (Teacher of Righteousness/Righteous Teacher) derives from a creative reading of Joel 2:23, "he has given you the early rain for vindication (המורה לצדקה)." See M. A. Knibb, "Teacher of Righteousness," *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls (= EDSS)* 918–21. The supplementary designation of the "Liar" or "Scoffer" as מטיף הכזב (Spouter/Dripper of Lies) is rooted in Micah 2:6, Amos 7:16 and 9:13, and probably in the parallel of the metaphor of spouting or dripping to the raining/teaching of the Teacher of Righteousness. See T. H. Lim, "Liar," *EDSS* 493–94. The term "Lion of Wrath" probably derives from Prov 19:12 and 20:2, and the general metaphor of lion for leadership, perhaps with wordplay between Wrath and Last (חרון/אחרון). See S. L. Berrin, *The Pesher Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169* (STDJ 53; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 104–7. On Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, see J. C. VanderKam "Those Who Look for Smooth Things, Pharisees, and Oral Law," in Paul et al., *Emanuel*, 465–77; Berrin, idem., 91–99.

[44] See the discussion of the term in Berrin, *The Pesher Nahum Scroll*, 205–8, and the literature cited there.

[45] Ibid., 109–15; see also 196–201.

Hyrcanus II in the civil war in the middle of the 1st c. B.C.E.[46] The basis for this epithet seems to be the pairing of Ephraim and Manasseh in the Hebrew Bible. The pairing of Egypt and Assyria in Nah 3 called for an identification of Egypt that would accommodate the corresponding identification of Assyria as Ephraim.[47]

Another important epithet rooted in the Pentateuch is "Kittim." The precise identification of the Kittim in the Dead Sea Scrolls has been the subject of much debate. It seems that the term variously refers to Seleucids or Romans. In any case, the typological function of the epithet, to designate currently powerful Gentile opponents, derives from Balaam's oracle in Num 24:24 "Ships come from the quarter of the Kittim; they subject Ashur, subject Eber. They, too shall perish."[48]

A somewhat more complicated epithet is the "House of Peleg" found in CD and in 4Q169. The referent for this term is uncertain, and it is not even clear whether it is of positive, negative, or variable valence. It is clear that it derives from Gen 10:25 (cf. *Jub.* 8:8), in which the figure Peleg is named for the dispersion of humanity subsequent to the episode of the Tower of Babel. Most likely, the epithet "House of Peleg" describes defectors from the Qumran community, adapting a name that is associated in the Pentateuch with a group that failed to build a city.[49]

To summarise, we have seen that the Qumran *pesharim* adopt a number of biblical Pentateuchal phrases as technical terms for use towards the authors' sectarian agenda, especially temporal terminology and proper names. The term אחרית הימים at Qumran does not only mean latter days, or even simply the last days, but refers specifically to the community's own experience within history's final era. The forty years of punishment in the wilderness of Sinai is taken as a paradigm for a forty year period of judgment in their time. The reckoning of jubilees is no longer a legal

---

[46] Ibid., 268–71.

[47] See D. Flusser, "Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes in Pesher Nahum," in *Judaism of the Second Temple Period. Volume 1: Qumran and Apocalypticism* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2007), 214–57.

[48] Cf. Lim, "Kittim," 469–71; Eshel, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State*, 163–79; Berrin, *The Pesher Nahum Scroll*, 101–4, and literature cited there.

[49] See R. T. White, "House of Peleg in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (ed. P. R. Davies and R. T. White; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 67–98; Berrin, *The Pesher Nahum Scroll*, 270–75.

calendrical matter, but a cosmic historical enterprise in anticipation of the final judgment, which is perceived as a time of "visitation" or "payback," to be followed by ultimate salvation of the righteous. Similarly, the term Kittim is adapted to refer typologically to the reigning power. We further noted that names of individuals found in the Pentateuch function as epithets for communities in the *pesharim*—thus, Judah, Ephraim, Manasseh, and Peleg.

Before closing our discussion of epithets in the *pesharim*, I would like to mention one quasi-typological use of Pentateuchal language and one nontypological adaptation of a Pentateuchal proper name in *pesher*. 4Q161 5–6 3 uses the title "Prince of the Congregation" to designate an eschatological military leader, who will arise in fulfillment of Balaam's oracle in Num 24:17. The source is identified explicitly in CD A 7:14–21.[50] References to the Prince of the Congregation do not exactly re-appropriate a biblical title, so much as they supply a contemporary referent to fill the position predicted by Balaam.

In a similar manner, the references to the "heads of the tribes of Israel" and to an eschatological 12-member council in 4Q164 (4QpIsaᵈ), present an idealized image of Israel rooted in the Pentateuch. The image is further developed by means of a symbolic representation of the *Urim* and *Thummim*.[51]

Finally, the function of the figure of Melchizedek in 11Q13 bears separate mention. The use of the name Melchizedek is not merely a symbolic

---

[50] "'A star shall come forth out of Jacob and a scepter shall rise out of Israel.' The sceptre is the Prince of the whole congregation and when he comes 'he shall smite all the children of Seth.'" Cf. 1QSb 5:20–21, 27; 1QM 5:1; 4Q266 3 iii 19; 4Q285 4 2, 6; 5 4; 6 2; 4Q376 1 iii 1). The use of the term "Nasi" has been viewed as deriving from Ezekiel (40:46; 44:15), and "all the congregation" may be associated with the plural "princes of the congregation" found in the Hexateuch. Cf. C. Evans, "Prince of the Congregation," *EDSS* 693–94. See also, J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995). Evans notes that the Targum to Ezek 34:24 "my servant David, a prince among them," and to the similar 37:25, renders "prince" as "king."

[51] Cf. J. M. Baumgarten, "The Duodecimal Courts of Qumran, Revelation and the Sanhedrin," *JBL* 95 (1976): 59–78; D. Flusser, "The Pesher of Isaiah and the Twelve Apostles," *E. L. Sukenik Memorial Volume* (Eretz-Israel 8; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1967), 52–62.

substitute designation for a contemporary entity, like "Kittim" or "Judah," but rather is meant to denote the actual name of a heavenly being. This is not a typological adaptation, but represents a development, or transformation, of the understanding of the nature of the individual named in Gen 14:18–20 and Ps 110:4.[52]

3. Implicit Interpretive Traditions

Implicit interpretation is, by definition, more difficult to spot than explicit citation or overt typological adoption of terminology. Determining its presence can be a somewhat subjective enterprise. The most basic means of identifying dependence upon a biblical text is linguistic: the occurrence of a rare word in a Qumran text often serves as a flag, directing the reader to a biblical source that can illuminate the context of the passage.[53] A prominent feature of Pentateuchal allusion in Qumran *pesher* is the pervasive influence of Deuteronomy. The following table lists expressions in the *pesharim* that derive from Deuteronomy.

---

[52] There have been attempts to see 11Q13 as an interpretation of Gen 14. A. Aschim, "Melchizedek the Liberator: An Early Interpretation of Genesis 14?" in *SBL Seminar Papers 1996* (SBLSP 35; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 243–58. García Martínez notes that neither Gen 14 nor Ps 110, which name Melchizedek, is cited explicitly in the extant parts of 11Q13, but that Aschim sees "echoes" of the Genesis text in the creative exegesis of 11Q13 ("The Traditions About Melchizedek," 98).

[53] Cf. J. A. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot* (STDJ 59; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 52–54; E. G. Chazon, "The Use of the Bible as a Key to Meaning in Psalms," in Paul et al., *Emanuel*, 85–96; eadem, "Scripture and Prayer in 'The Words of the Luminaries'" in *Prayers That Cite Scripture* (ed. J. L. Kugel; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), 25–41. In discussing the employment of scripture in the legal section of 4QMMT, Bernstein distinguishes between the use of "biblical language and style" ("Employment and Interpretation," 32–36) and "implicit scriptural exegesis" (ibid., 36–38).

(1)	4Q177 and 4Q182 4Q177 11, 10, 26, 9, 20, 7, line 16 "rem]oved the foreskin of their heart" (הסי]רו ערלת ל[ב ב]שרם) 4Q182 "they will stiffen their necks" (יקשו את ערפם)[54]	Deut 10:16 ומלתם את ערלת לבבכם וערפכם לא תקשו עוד
(2)	4Q177 4 14 "they have spoken revolt against him" (וידברו עליו סרה)[55]	Deut 13:6 (false prophet) והנביא ההוא או חלם החלום ההוא יומת כי דבר סרה
(3)	4Q167 2 6 "God will hide his face" (יסתיר אל את פניו)[56]	Deut 31–32 (covenant curses): key expression Deut 31:17 והסתרתי פני מהם 31:18 הסתר אסתיר פני 32:30 אסתירה פני מהם
(4)	4Q174 1–3 ii 2 "and they will observe (lit. "do") all of the Torah"[57] (ועשו את כול התורה; cf. 1–2 i 7 מעשי תורה)	Deut 27:26; 28:58; 29:28; 31:12; 32:46 עשה√ את כל דברי התורה הזאת

---

[54] The idiom "stiff-necked" קשה ערף, is common as an adjective, but the verbal phrase appears less frequently in BH and is more evocative. In 2 Kgs 17:14, Jer 7:26, and Neh 9:16 the verbal phrase is associated with ancestral behavior.

[55] The collocation is also found in CD 5:21; 12:3 (and parallels in 4Q267 2 5, 4 13; 4Q271 5 i 18; in 4Q270 2 ii 14 it refers to the rejection of "those anointed with the holy spirit." Cf. 1Q29, 4Q375 1 i 4–5, 4Q376 (J. Strugnell, *DJD* 19:111–36).

[56] The lexical choice of this phrase was inspired by the lemma, "until they seek my face" in Hos 5:15. It is not an uncommon phrase in the Hebrew Bible, but the use in Deuteronomy is distinctive.

[57] On this Deuteronomistic idiom, see M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), 336 par. 17b.

(5)	11Q13 2:5 "And from the inheritance of Melchizedek" (ומנחלת מלכיצדק)[58]	Probably Deut 32:8 (cf. LXX)[59] בהנחל עליון גוים בהפרידו בני אדם יצב גבלת עמים למספר בני ישראל
(6)	4Q169 and 4Q166 4Q169 3–4 ii 4–6 חרחור (applying the imagery of the military defeat of Nineveh to the devastating effects of warfare on the Judean population) 4Q166 1:8 בשגעון]ובעורון ובתמהון [לב (associated with "generation of visitation," stereotyped designation for final judgment, pertaining to metaphor of debt as sin)	Deut 28 (covenant curses) Deut 28:22 (hapax legomenon in BH) יככה ה' בשחפת ובקדחת ובדלקת ובחרחר ובחרב ובשדפון ובירקון ורדפוך עד אבדך Deut 28:28 יככה ה' בשגעון ובעורון ובתמהון לבב

In addition to linguistic dependence upon Deuteronomy, there are also instances in which *pesharim* reflect interpretive traditions of passages in Deuteronomy without using language derived from any particular biblical verse. We have already noted that broad traditions concerning restricted access to the Temple/Community probably underlie the references to Deuteronomy in 4Q174 and perhaps in 4Q177. In the latter case, it is Deut 7:15 that is cited, but the traditions about the holiness of the camp are implicit. Similar dependence upon broad traditions, without explicit citation, is found in the controversial passage about crucifixion in Pesher Nahum and in the depiction of the relationship between the priests and

---

[58] On the tradition of the division of humanity in accordance with heavenly beings and Deut 32:8–9, see J. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, Excursus 31, 514–15; M. S. Smith, *God in Translation: Deities in Cross-Cultural Discourse in the Biblical World* (FAT series I, 57; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 139–43 and 195–224.

[59] In accordance with Van der Woude, "Melchizedek als himmlische Erlöser-gestalt" (apud J. A. Fitzmyer, "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11," *JBL* 86 [1967]: 25–41). Fitzmyer himself sees Josh 18:7 as the biblical basis for the reference to "inheritance" in 11Q13 (32).

Davidic ruler in Pesher Isaiah[a]. Regarding the reference to "hanging alive" in Pesher Nahum (4Q169 3–4 i 6–9), there is general agreement that the passage includes at least some echo of Deut 21:22. I have argued elsewhere that Pesher Nahum employs the Pentateuchal legislation about hanging for its own purposes, to present a historical event as the fulfillment of divine prophecy.[60] The effectiveness of evoking the verse in this manner would require a pre-existing exegetical tradition, such that an allusion to Deut 21:22 would call to mind humiliation and accursedness associated with hanging/crucifixion. Attestation of such a tradition may be found in 11QTᵃ 64.

The *pesher* of Isa 11:3 in 4Q161 touches upon another controversial topic in Qumran studies—the roles of priestly and Davidic messianic figures. For our purposes, I wish to observe that the *pesher* is modeled upon the description of the king in Deut 17, and is influenced by the location of this passage, sandwiched between descriptions of the judicial role of the priests earlier in ch. 17 and of priestly and levitical status in ch. 18.[61]

The *pesharim* also exhibit evidence of broad exegetical traditions stemming from books other than Deuteronomy. Above, we have noted that the eschatological recasting of the jubilee system in 11Q13 is an extension of earlier interpretation of Lev 25 and 26, with dependence upon the development of the concept of sin as debt. We also pointed out that the term

---

[60] On the relationship between Deut 21:22 כי קללת אלהים תלוי and 4Q169 3–4 i 6–9 ("for of the one hanged alive on the tree it is said, 'Behold I am against you'") see Berrin, *The Pesher Nahum Scroll*, Excursus to ch. 5, 165–92, and the literature cited there. Textually, the connection of the crucifixion described in the *pesher* to Deuteronomy may be rooted either in (1) the conceptual and semantic significance of the term טרף in the lemma, associated with the vulnerability of the hanged corpse to predatory and scavenging animals, or (2) in the opposition of God found in the next lemma. Perhaps both of these exegetical triggers are relevant. The expansion and adaptation of Deut 21:22 in 11QTᵃ 64:6–13 offers evidence of an exegetical tradition associating the Pentateuchal text with crucifixion of political traitors, who are portrayed as having cursed and been accursed.

[61] In Jeremiah, the Law (תורה) is associated with the priest, just as counsel is associated with the wise, and the word with the prophet (Jer 18:18; cf. Ezek 7:26). In texts dated to the Persian period, the priest is explicitly linked with teaching ("teaching priest"; כהן מורה) and the Law (2 Chron 15:3; cf. Mal 2:7). Cf. the blessing of Levi in Deut 33:10 "They shall teach your laws to Jacob and your instructions to Israel."

פקודת הארץ probably reflects an adaptation of the latter tradition, with dependence upon Lev 18:25, ותטמא הארץ ואפקד עונה עליה ותקא הארץ את ישביה. I would suggest that the same concept underlies the expression חובת הארץ in 4Q162 2:1. The short *pesher* interpretation on Isa 5:6–10 (or some portion thereof) designates the time of the fulfillment of the prophecy: פשר הדבר לאחרית הימים לחובת הארץ. Allegro suggested emending the word חובה to חרבה, and translated "the devastation of the land," but this is unnecessary (as noted by Horgan, although the noun does not appear in Biblical Hebrew, it is attested in Mishnaic Hebrew).[62] Just as the use of distinctive biblical language can point to biblical allusion, the use of nonbiblical language can often flag biblical interpretation—the reworking of an exegetical tradition. The term חובה, obligation, seems to point to the concept of sin as debt, and to the eschatological remittance of that debt by means of the unleashing of divine wrath against the land. In Isa 5:5–7, the metaphor of Israel as God's vineyard is completed with a description of desolation that is similar to the devastation of the land as described in Lev 26. There may also be a linguistic tie between Lev 26 and the lemma from Isaiah. Isaiah 5:9 describes the depopulation of the land with the phrase אם לא בתים רבים לשמה יהיו. The noun שמה itself is not a very uncommon one in the Hebrew Bible (though it is found predominantly in Jeremiah). However, unusual forms of the root שמם pervade Lev 26:31–43, and the locution in Isa 5:9 particularly calls to mind the form השמה, in Lev 26:34.

Our final example of a broad exegetical tradition employed in the *pesharim*, is the use of the expression "uplifted hand" to describe the deliberate sinfulness of the Community's opponents. In 4Q171 IV 15, Ps 37:35–36 is applied to the Man of Lies. The biblical image of the "ruthless wicked man, who displayed himself like a leafy tree" is associated with arrogant sinfulness. The use of the phrase הזיד ביד רמה ("acted impertinently with an uplifted hand") to describe a religious opponent of the Community has the force of a technical term, rooted in a sectarian interpretation of Num 15:29–30 that is found in 1QS 5:11–12[63]: כיא לוא החשבו בבריתו

---

[62] Horgan, PTSDSSP 6B, 42. She points to the restoration in Aramaic 4Q534. Note that É. Puech has changed his initial reading of חובתה at 2:17 to חוביא (Puech, *DJD* 13:149).

[63] See E. Qimron, "Terminology for Intention Used in the Legal Texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies* 10/1 (1990): 103–10 [Hebrew]. Qimron observes that the term "*nistarot*" is used in some Qumran

כיא לוא בקשו ולוא דרשהו בחוקוהי לדעת הנסתרות אשר תעו בם לאש<ש>מה
והנגלות עשו ביד רמה. Those who are not members of the Community are
guilty of not seeking hidden laws and of deliberately and blatantly violat-
ing revealed laws. The pesherist in 4Q171 communicates the force of his
condemnation of the Liar by using the term "uplifted hand," thereby
evoking the sectarian understanding of Num 15:30. The context in
4Q182 is not well-preserved, but ויפרעו ביד רמה in 1:3 seems to function
similarly.[64]

4. Conclusion

Our examination of the use of Pentateuch in the Qumran *pesharim* can
serve to strengthen appreciation of the theological concerns of *pesher*. In
particular, I would point to the importance of Deuteronomy, and to the
nature of the interpretive traditions that have emerged in this study.

4.1. *Prominence of Deuteronomy*

Deuteronomy is cited in the *pesharim* more than other book of the Penta-
teuch, both in explicit citation and through allusions. The most popular
biblical books at Qumran (Psalms, 39 copies; Deuteronomy, 30 copies;
Isaiah, 21 copies) were understood as literary records of the prophetic com-
munication to David, Moses, and Isaiah, respectively.[65] It may be noted that
these works are also the most frequently represented in the *pesharim*.

The fourth most popular biblical book at Qumran is Genesis (20 copies).
If we include the data from the related works of 4Q252, 4Q464 (*Lives*

---

texts to designate inadvertent sins, committed unwittingly or in ignorance of the
law, in opposition to the term "*niglot*" which is used to refer to deliberate sins,
committed both knowingly and willfully.

[64] Cf. Neh 9:16, 29 where הזידו appears with stiffening of the neck.

[65] Scriptural citation outside of the *pesharim* appears to corroborate the frequent
citation of Deuteronomy and Isaiah, though not that of Psalms. According to
Vermes's 1989 study, the most-frequently cited biblical books in CD, 1QS and
1QM are Deuteronomy (11 times) and Isaiah (9 times). "Biblical Proof-Texts in
Qumran Literature" *JSS* 34 (1989): 493–508 at 493–94. Note too that the *Temple
Scroll* is largely patterned on the book of Deuteronomy, as is the covenant ceremony
in 1QS.

of the Patriarchs), 4Q180, and the *Damascus Document*, then this further corroborates the alignment between the number of copies of a biblical book at Qumran, and the use of that book for *pesher*-type exegesis. Although Genesis does not present itself as prophetic communication, it was viewed in antiquity as an eschatological paradigm. Determinism and reward and punishment were essential ideas in the worldview of the Qumran Community, and in the milieu in which the Community emerged. The use of the word "*pesher*" in treatments of the Genesis and early Exodus narratives demonstrates the development of these ideas. Apocalyptic understanding of biblical narratives about the *Urzeit*, as represented by *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, became more narrowly focused in Qumran writings. There was a move toward the construction of a myth in which the deeds of the first beings and patriarchs are viewed as a vehicle for revelation about the Community's own situation and imminent salvation. The Community perceived this salvation as a reward for their own proper observance of the law, in fulfillment of the prediction of conditional restoration that is central to the articulation of covenantal nomism in the framework of the book of Deuteronomy.[66]

---

[66] The main tenets of Deuteronomic theology as listed by Weinfeld are: "(1) the struggle against idolatry; (2) the centralization of the cult; (3) exodus, covenant, and election; (4) the monotheistic creed; (5) observance of the law and loyalty to the covenant; (6) inheritance of the land; (7) retribution and material motivation," and, in the Deuteronomist, "(8) fulfillment of prophecy and (9) the election of the Davidic dynasty." (Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 1). Most of these points can be seen to drive the theological agenda in the explicitly programmatic 1QS and in the Damascus Document, frequently expressed by means of Deuteronomic language. Some of the tenets become re-shaped at Qumran. Thus, the core of the struggle is primarily against the Sons of Darkness who reject God through disobedience or improper worship rather than through worship of other deities; and the centrality of Jerusalem, though presumed in some texts of the Community, tends to be presented not as a theological obligation but as an ideal and an element in the anticipated redemption. Of the Deuteronomistic elements identified by Weinfeld, the fulfillment of prophecy is a primary concern in Qumran writings, and especially Qumran pesher. Thus, Elliger's oft-cited hermeneutical principle of pesher: "Prophetische Verkündigung hat zum Inhalt das Ende, und die Gegenwart ist die Endzeit" (K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer* [BHT 15; Tübingen: Mohr, 1953], 150). The emphasis on elect leadership, and particularly eschatological leaders, though not exclusively of Davidic genealogy, permeates Qumran literature.

4.2. *Reliance on Exegetical Traditions*

Whereas *pesher* interpretations of psalms and prophets generally exhibit signs of original exegesis by the pesherist, especially the use of literary devices to apply the biblical verses to sectarian interests, the use of the Pentateuch exhibits greater dependence upon pre-existing exegetical traditions. This is evident in the selection of texts that are explicitly cited, and in the typological adaptation of epithets and term for time. It is also evident in the recurrence of such interpretive traditions as the application of the covenant curses and blessings to the Community's experience, and the eschatological understanding of the blessings of Balaam and Moses.

The prominence of Deuteronomy, and the application of Pentateuchal exegetical traditions, highlight the nature of Qumran *pesher* as fulfillment literature. The purpose of these writings is to identify the Elect and non-Elect within a designated time period, and to demonstrate the actualization of divine prophecies concerning the reward and punishment of these groups, in anticipation of the ultimate salvation of the authors' Community.[67]