

Dear reader,

This is an author-produced version of an article published in *Dead Sea Discoveries* 16 (2009). It agrees with the manuscript submitted by the author for publication but does not include the final publisher's layout or pagination.

Original publication:

Holtz, Gudrun

Inclusivism at Qumran

in: *Dead Sea Discoveries* 16 (2009), pp. 22-54

Leiden: Brill 2009

URL <https://doi.org/10.1163/156851709X395759>

Access to the published version may require subscription.

Published in accordance with the policy of Brill Publishers: <https://brill.com/page/selfarchiving>

Your IxTheo team

---

Liebe\*r Leser\*in,

dies ist eine von dem/der Autor\*in zur Verfügung gestellte Manuskriptversion eines Aufsatzes, der in *Dead Sea Discoveries* 16 (2009) erschienen ist. Der Text stimmt mit dem Manuskript überein, das der/die Autor\*in zur Veröffentlichung eingereicht hat, enthält jedoch *nicht* das Layout des Verlags oder die endgültige Seitenzählung.

Originalpublikation:

Holtz, Gudrun

Inclusivism at Qumran

in: *Dead Sea Discoveries* 16 (2009), pp. 22-54

Leiden: Brill 2009

URL <https://doi.org/10.1163/156851709X395759>

Die Verlagsversion ist möglicherweise nur gegen Bezahlung zugänglich.

Diese Manuskriptversion wird im Einklang mit der Policy des Verlags Brill publiziert:

<https://brill.com/page/selfarchiving>

Ihr IxTheo-Team

Gudrun Holtz

## INCLUSIVISM AT QUMRAN

Within Early Judaism the Qumran Community<sup>1</sup> is widely perceived as a strictly exclusivist group<sup>2</sup>. Along with many other scholars, this view is held by L. H. Schiffman, who states it both for the eschatology of the Community and for its self-understanding in historical time: “For the Qumran sect, the messianic redemption was not to be the universal experience foretold by the prophet Isaiah; it was to be theirs and theirs alone”<sup>3</sup>. Similarly, he regards the Qumranites, after their retreat to the Dead Sea, as increasingly self-centered and reclusive: “(T)he Qumran Zadokites gradually developed the sectarian mentality of the despised,

---

<sup>1</sup> Along with the majority of scholars I mean by the term “Qumran Community” (or “the Community”) the community whose literary remnants are part of the documents found in Khirbet Qumran (plus CD). This community forms part of the wider Essene movement (cf. A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” *TRE* 28:65) and comprises different sub-communities or groups (see e.g. C. Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Tradition and Redaction* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 191; E. Regev, “The Yahad and the Damascus Covenant: Structure, Organization and Relationship,” *RevQ* 21 (2003), 256-62; M. Broshi, “Essenes at Qumran? A Rejoinder to Albert Baumgarten,” *DSD* 14 (2007), 26; H. Evans Kapfer, “The Relationship between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule: Attitudes toward the Temple as a Test Case,” *DSD* 14 (2007), 156. Similarly, by “Qumranites” I refer to the members of the Essene movement as represented in the Essene texts of the Qumran library. Depending upon the text, the term refers to either the members of just one group of the movement or to Qumran-Essene Judaism as such. The texts included in this article exclusively belong to those materials of the Qumran library which are generally accepted as Essene or, being pre- or proto-Essene, are closely related to the Qumran Community. Origin and time of origin of the texts will be discussed in the footnotes. For criteria for identifying Essene texts see C. A. Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran,” in *The Hebrew Bible and its Interpreters* (ed. W. H. Propp et al.; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167-87; D. Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance”, in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989-1990* (ed. D. Dimant and L. H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23-58; A. Lange 1995, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 6-20; Lange and Lichtenberger, *TRE* 28:45-46; C. Hempel, “Kriterien zur Bestimmung ‘essenischer Verfasserschaft’ von Qumrantexten,” in *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 59-69; A. Lange, “Kriterien essenischer Texte,” in *Qumran kontrovers*, 71-85.

<sup>2</sup> For a major voice questioning what practically has become an opinio communis cf. H. Stegemann, “The Qumran Essenes: Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls Madrid 18-21 March, 1991* (ed. J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; vol. 1; STDJ 11/1; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 91, and H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus: Ein Sachbuch* (Freiburg: Herder 1993) 229-31.

<sup>3</sup> L. H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 384. For further authors see, e.g., G. Boccaccini, *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 261-62; E. P. Sanders, “The Dead Sea Sect and other Jews. Commonalities, Overlaps and Differences,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. T. H. Lim; Edinburgh: Clark, 2000), 42-43; A. Schremer, “Seclusion and Exclusion: The Rhetoric of Separation in Qumran and Tannaitic Literature,” in *Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. S. C. Fraade et al.; STDJ 62; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 128-32; and esp. G. W. E. Nickelsburg, “Religious Exclusivism: A World View Governing Some Texts Found at Qumran,” in *George W.E. Nickelsburg in Perspective. An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning* (ed. J. Neusner and A. J. Avery-Peck; vol. 1; JSJ.S 80/1; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 140, who judges “an exclusivist world view” to be the defining moment of the “sectarian” part of Qumran literature.

rejected, and abandoned outcast. Accordingly, they began to look upon themselves as the true Israel, condemning and despising all others"<sup>4</sup>. This understanding is also reflected in the interpretation of the laws dealing with the relationship of members of the Community to non-Essene Judaism. They are usually regarded as expressing "the necessity for separation from those who were not members of the community" in general<sup>5</sup>.

A thorough analysis of Qumran texts, however, reveals, apart from the dominant strand of exclusivism, remarkably clear inclusivist tendencies, which are to be found in the major texts of the Community. The purpose of this paper is to bring these tendencies to the fore and, connected therewith, to state the structure of Qumran separatism more precisely. Inclusivism, in the following, is understood to mean any attempt on the part of the Community to reach out beyond its own confines and to open up for the outside world.

### 1. Forms of Eschatological Inclusivism

The dominant eschatological pattern in Qumran texts is dualism. Accordingly, within humankind two groups are differentiated, those who on the day of judgment are to be saved and those who will be destroyed. Certain of the texts which conform to this pattern need to be qualified as exclusivist. They identify the group to be saved and the one to be destroyed in clear sociological terms, that is with the Qumran Community on the one hand and the rest of humankind, non-Essene Israel and/or the nations, on the other<sup>6</sup>. There are, however, a few texts which, although dualistic as well, are inclusivist in the sense that they operate on the plane of humankind and do not identify the prospectively saved and annihilated as belonging to specific sociological groups. These texts allow for the possibility that people other than those who sympathize with the respective author and his group are to be counted among the

---

<sup>4</sup> Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 88-89. The term "Qumran Zadokites" reflects Schiffman's specific reconstruction of the parties of second century (B.C.E.) Judaism; cf. *ibid.* 87-89.

<sup>5</sup> M. A. Knibb 1987, *The Qumran Community* (CCWJCW 2; Cambridge: University Press, 1987), 105. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 110, explains the respective laws under the heading: "Relations with Outsiders". This interpretation, in the first place, is based on the identification of the "men of injustice" (אנשי העול) with non-Essene Judaism; further cf., e.g., *idem*, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code* (BJSt 33; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983), 60 ("other Jews of Palestine" [in contrast to the "sectarians"]); J. Licht, *The Rule Scroll. A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea: IQS, IQSa, IQSb. Text, Introduction and Commentary* (Hebrew; Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 1965), 128 (העולם שמחוקק) (לכת); Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 105 ("non-members of the community, those under the control of the spirit of injustice"); G. A. Anderson, "The Status of the Torah before Sinai: The Retelling of the Bible in the Damascus Covenant and the Book of Jubilees," *DSD* 1 (1994), 14 ("common Israelite"); H. Räisänen, "Paul's and Qumran's Judaism" in *Judaism in Late Antiquity: Part 5: The Judaism of Qumran: Vol 2: World View, Comparing Judaisms* (ed. A. J. Avery-Peck et al.; HdO 57; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 189 ("the rest of humanity, especially other Israelites"). Cf. similarly P. R. Davies, *The Damascus Document. An Interpretation of the 'Damascus Document'* (JSOT.S 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), 128, who circumscribes the term "children of the pit" (בני השחת) - it is synonymous with "men of injustice" - by "those outside the community, who are outside God's saving plan for Israel"; Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 111, who likewise regards the term "men of deceit" (אנשי הרמיה) to refer "to Jews who were not members of the group"; Schremer, "Seclusion," 131-32, who identifies the "men of deceit" (אנשי הרמיה) and the "men of injustice" (אנשי העול) with the non-Essene "rest of Jewish society".

<sup>6</sup> Cf. esp. 1QM 1:1-9; 14:4-12; CD 8:4-6, 9; 20:22-34.

saved<sup>7</sup>. In addition there are different forms of eschatological inclusivism which are unconnected with dualism. The entities seen as participating in the eschatological hope of the Qumran Community are non-Essene Israel, the nations and/or the whole of creation.

(a) The hope that major parts of Israel will join the Community eschatologically is expressed in several traditions. 4QMMT<sup>e</sup> 11-13 4-5<sup>8</sup> envisages the return of an indefinite number of Israelites to the Torah as interpreted by the Community (וזה הוא אחרית הימים שישובו בישראל) (לת[ורה]).<sup>9</sup> From the preceding context it is clear that this return means the inclusion in the participation in the eschatological blessings.

1QSa 1:1<sup>10</sup> assumes the eschatological integration of “all the congregation of Israel” (כול עדת) (ישראל), of men, children and women (1:4), into the Community<sup>11</sup>. Upon joining it they will be instructed in all its regulations so as not to break its law (1:5). The eschatological inclusion of “all the congregation of Israel” in the Community also seems to make those eligible to join in the Messianic meal who, before the end of days, did not form part of Essene Judaism<sup>12</sup>.

4QpNah 3-4 iii 3-5<sup>13</sup> expects the adherents of the Pharisees to go over to the Qumran Community at the end of days: “And when the glory of Judah” - that is, the Community<sup>14</sup> - “is re[ve]aled the simple people of Ephraim (פתאי אפרים)” - the adherents of the Pharisees<sup>15</sup> - “will flee from among their assembly and desert the ones who misdirected them and will join

---

<sup>7</sup> Cf. 1QS 4:2-14; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 7:25-34 (1QH<sup>a</sup> is referred to according to E. Schuller, *DJD* 40); in addition see 11QMelch, a text whose horizon is Israel as a whole. Cf. G. Holtz, *Damit Gott sei alles in allem: Studien zum paulinischen und frühjüdischen Universalismus* (BZNW 149; Berlin: deGruyter, 2007), 90-93; 114-17.

<sup>8</sup> E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *DJD* 10:121, judge MMT to be “a group composition, originating in the Qumran group, or in one of its antecedents, probably between 159-152 BCE”. At that time the Qumran group and its leader, presumably the Teacher of Righteousness, on the one hand and the addressees of MMT, an individual leader and his people of Israel, on the other hand seem to have been on “relatively eirenic” terms.

<sup>9</sup> If not stated otherwise (cf. n. 7), Hebrew text and translation follow the edition of F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition* (2 vols; DSSSE; Leiden: Brill 2000). For this passage see also J. Dunn, “4QMMT and Galatians,” *NTS* 43 (1997), 148-49, n. 112.

<sup>10</sup> 1QSa is Essene in character. It is assumed to date from between 150 B.C.E. and the beginning of the first century B.C.E.; cf. Lange and Lichtenberger, *TRE* 28:59.

<sup>11</sup> For this interpretation of כול עדת ישראל see E. Koffmann, “Die staatsrechtliche Stellung der essenischen Vereinigungen in der griechisch-römischen Periode,” *Bib.* 44 (1963), 51-52; Licht, *Rule Scroll*, 242-43, 245; D. Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (ed. M. E. Stone; CRINT II/2; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 517; J. Maier, “Zum Begriff יהוד in den Texten von Qumran,” in *Qumran* (ed. K. E. Grözinger et al.; WdF 410; Darmstadt: WBG, 1981), 228; E. Schürer et al., *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135)* (vol. 3.1; Edinburgh: Clark, 1986), 386; L. H. Schiffman 1989, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study in the Rule of the Congregation* (SBL.MS 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press 1989), 12; J. J. Collins 1997, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997), 108; M. G. Abegg, “The Covenant of the Qumran Sectarials,” in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period* (ed. S. E. Porter and J. C. R. de Roo; JSJ.S 71; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 96. Licht, *Rule Scroll*, 243, and Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 12, specify כול עדת ישראל as all Israel minus the enemies of the Congregation who are to perish in the eschatological war; see also below n. 26.

<sup>12</sup> Compare 1QSa 1:1 (כול עדת ישראל) ... בה <א-ספם [ליהוד] with 1QSa 2:12 (כול עדת ישראל) and 2:21 (כול עדת היחד). Women, children and the impure, however, seem to be excluded from this meal; see Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 56.

<sup>13</sup> 4QpNah is of Essene origin and dates back to 67-63 B.C.E.; cf. S. Berrin, “Peshar Nahum,” *EDSS* 2:654.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (CBQ.MS 8; Washington: The Catholic Association of America, 1979), 161.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Horgan, *Pesharim*, 186, and esp. Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 216.

the [majori]ty ([רוב]) [of I]srael” - that is, the Community (iii 4-5)<sup>16</sup>. Judging from the related text 4QpNah 3-4 ii 8-10 “the simple people of Ephraim” comprises all Israel except for the Pharisees, namely “kings, princes, priests and people together with the proselyte attached to them” (מלכים שרים כהנים ועם עם גר נלוה) (3-4 ii 9)<sup>17</sup>. For 4QpNah iii, then, the Qumran Community is the eschatological place of refuge for the large majority of misdirected Israel, whereas the Pharisees, who misguided them, are doomed to perish (iii 7-8)<sup>18</sup>.

A common future for all Israel is finally anticipated in 4QFlor 1:10-13<sup>19</sup>. The fallen “hut of David” (Am 9,11), which is identified with the messianic branch of David, will be raised by God in order that Israel will be saved (1:13 להושיע את ישראל). “Israel” here is not used as a self-description of the Community, but rather refers to the people of Israel as a whole<sup>20</sup>.

(b) Two traditions bind the future of the nations to the Qumran Community or to one of its eschatological figures. In 1QSb 4:24-28<sup>21</sup> the eschatological high priest is understood as “God’s own agent within creation and history”<sup>22</sup>. He is ritually to cast the lot for humankind thus effecting God’s cosmic allotment of destiny on earth. The universal dimension of his calling is evident from the parallelism 4:27 in which the terms תבל and רבים figure: “And may he make you hol[y] among his people, like a luminary [ . . . ] for the world (לתבל) in knowledge, and to shine on the face of the Many (רבים)”<sup>23</sup>. The emphasis on the illumination given by the high priest underlines the salvific aspect of his dealings with the world.

In 1QH<sup>a</sup> 14:13-16<sup>24</sup> the destiny of the nations is bound up with the Community. God’s purpose in establishing the Congregation is his own glory (14:13 לכבודכה)<sup>25</sup>. It becomes manifest only when God is acknowledged by all nations. “(A)nd all the peoples (כול גוים) may know your truth and all the nations (כול לאומים) your glory” (14:15)<sup>26</sup>. To this end the role of the Community is defined: “to [ . . . ] the men of your council amongst the sons of Adam, to recount to everlasting generations your wonders, that they may contemplate [your] exploits unceasingly” (14:13-15). This seemingly active role of the council members is

---

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 216.

<sup>17</sup> For a detailed argumentation cf. Holtz, *Gott*, 111-12.

<sup>18</sup> For a partially similar text cf. 1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:6-28, esp. 12:19-21, 27-28.

<sup>19</sup> 4QFlor is of Essene origin and dates back to 71-63 B.C.E.; cf. Lange and Lichtenberger, *TRE* 28: 49-50.

<sup>20</sup> This follows both from the usage of the word “Israel” in the passage 1:1-13, which is held together by 2Sam 7,10-14, and from the self-descriptions of the Community in 4QFlor 1 among which “Israel” is missing. Cf. also G. W. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOT.S 29; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 271, n. 331, and J. Zimmermann 1998, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellung in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT 2:104; Tübingen: Mohr), 111.

<sup>21</sup> 1QSb is Essene in character. Its terminus ante quem is around 100 B.C.E.; cf. Schürer, *History*, 457-58.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 153.

<sup>23</sup> The quoted parallelism seems to be the middle part of the chiasmic parallelism 4:27-28 (abba); the beginning of 4:28, however, is not certain.

<sup>24</sup> The texts from 1QH<sup>a</sup> discussed here and in the following form part of the community hymns which, being Essene in character, go back to 150-100 B.C.E.; cf. Lange and Lichtenberger, *TRE* 28:64.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Licht, *Rule Scroll*, 157.

<sup>26</sup> The expressions כול גוים and כול לאומים are not to be taken in the sense of the sum of all individual members of the nations. As is the case with 4QpNah 3-4 iii 3-6 and 1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:6-28 regarding the differentiation between the Pharisees and the majority a number of texts dealing with the future of the nations very well differentiates between the actual enemies of the congregation and the rest of the nations. Cf. esp. 1QM 11:13-14; 17:5-6; 18:1-3; 1QSb 3:27-28; for details see Holtz, *Gott*, 101-3.

complemented by a rather passive one. God has brought his truth and glory to the Community<sup>27</sup>, where it can be discerned by the nations<sup>28</sup>. In this sense the nations will indirectly participate in that which in its fullness, however, is the prerogative of the Community.

(c) In this section texts are discussed which deal with the eschatological renewal of creation and of humans without differentiating between members of the Qumran Community and the rest of Israel or, as the case may be, humankind. This renewal is thought of to follow upon the destruction of evil and injustice at the final judgment.

The blessing 4QSM 8 1-11 par 11QSM 1 ii 2-15, which is to be said after the victory over the Kittim in the final eschatological war<sup>29</sup>, is aimed at the whole congregation of Israel. It has to be pronounced before “[all the sons of I]srael” (2 8)<sup>30</sup>. Israel will be blessed with the full eschatological yield of its land (8 4-8) and the disappearance of all negative aspects of life (8 8-10).

In 1QS 4:18-23<sup>31</sup> the eschatological transformation concerns two levels, the cosmic and the individual<sup>32</sup>. As to the cosmic plane upon obliteration of injustice, the truth of God<sup>33</sup>, which before was defiled by evil, will “rise up forever (in) the world” (4:19). On the individual plane it results in the fundamental purification of “the structure of man (מבני איש)<sup>34</sup>, ripping

---

<sup>27</sup> Cf. J. Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea: Text, Introduction, Commentary and Glossary* (Hebrew; Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 1957), 113.

<sup>28</sup> M. Delcor, *Les Hymnes de Qumran (Hodayot): Texte hébreu, introduction, traduction, commentaire* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1962), 176, reads הבהיאותם in place of הביאותה (14:15) and translates: “Tu les as introduits”. This phrase he takes to mean “la conversion des peuples à l’essénisme par l’intermédiaire de la communauté”. The preceding context, however, very clearly shows that to the author the final goal of the nations is the realization of the truth and glory of God, not conversion.

<sup>29</sup> The blessing is preceded by passages on the eschatological war against the Kittim (4QSM 6+4 5).

<sup>30</sup> For this text cf. P. S. Alexander and G. Vermes, *DJD* 36:241. See also 4QSM 8 9-11: “your congregation (עדתכם)”. As in biblical Hebrew עדה in the eschatological writings of the Qumran Community means “all Israel”, so that in 1QSM 8 1 the “Congregation being blessed” is “eschatological Israel in possession of the land of Israel” (W. J. Lyons, “Possessing the Land: The Qumran Sect and the Eschatological Victory,” *DSD* 3 [1996], 145; see also B. Nitzan, “Benedictions and Instructions for the Eschatological Community [11QBer; 4Q285],” *RevQ* 16 [1993/95], 79, 81; Alexander and Vermes, *DJD* 36:243). Lyons, “Possessing the Land,” 151, assumes that the b<sup>r</sup>acha 4Q285/11Q14 originally might have been a pre-Essene text what according to him “... was certainly no obstacle to the incorporation of the text into the thoroughly sectarian eschatological” text 4QSM. The terminus ante quem of 4QSM is the end of the 1st century B.C.E.; cf. Alexander and Vermes, *DJD* 36:232.

<sup>31</sup> 1QS 3:13-4:26, the Two-Spirit-Treatise, has lately been qualified as pre-Essene; cf. H. Stegemann, “Zu Textbestand und Grundgedanken von 1QS III,13-IV,26,” *RevQ* 13 (1988), 96-100, 127; Lange, *Weisheit*, 126-28; Lange and Lichtenberger, *TRE* 28:57.

<sup>32</sup> Contrary to a widespread consensus the dualistic conception of 1QS 3:13-4:26 does not concern the pair of opposites of Qumran Community and outside world, it is rather related to two ethically opposing groups within humankind which remain sociologically unidentified. As Stegemann, “Textbestand,” 126, remarks, with the exception of the term על ישראל (3:24) Israel is not mentioned in the text, but “alle Aussagen (betreffen) ganz grundsätzlich die Menschheit im allgemeinen”.

<sup>33</sup> In 4:20 God is identified with truth: אל באמתו.

<sup>34</sup> For a non-partitive reading of מבני איש cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 79 (“the structure of man”); Licht, *Rule Scroll*, 103 (גוף האדם); Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 101 (“the frame of man”); E. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d’une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien* (2 vols; ÉtB 22; Paris: Gabalda, 1993), 429 (“la bâtisse [= le corps] de chacun”); J. Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer* (vol. 1; Basel: utb Reinhardt, 1995), 176 (“Bau [des] Menschen”); J. H. Charlesworth and E. Qimron, *PTSDSSP* 1:19 (“the sons of man”). But see A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning* (London: SCM Press, 1966), 157; E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran*

out all spirit of injustice from the innermost part of his flesh, and cleansing him with the spirit of holiness from every wicked deeds” (4:20-21) so as to prepare him for receiving the lost glory of Adam (4:23). It is man as such, not the Qumranites, who is seen as the thoroughly transformed human being who, according to Stegemann, represents “den jetzigen Gegebenheiten gegenüber etwas total Neues”<sup>35</sup>. The reasoning given for the fact that one part of humankind is eschatologically cleansed, whereas the other is meant for obliteration, is election (4:22)<sup>36</sup>.

Similarly, the idea of eschatological healing is central for the hymn 1QH<sup>a</sup> 19:18-30. It will happen after the iniquity of the present time is destroyed and ravaging diseases (19:25), anguish, and sighing are no more (19:29). At that point the harp of lament will be changed for the harp of salvation and the song of happiness, joy, and praise will be sung without cease (19:26-29)<sup>37</sup>. The hymn 1QH<sup>a</sup> 19 goes beyond 1QS 4:18-23 in that it not only includes humankind in the future transformation of reality but also the whole plethora of creation (19:27). It is not quite clear if the phrase “until iniquity be destroyed” (עד כלות עולה; 19:25) is meant to indicate the destruction of the iniquitous also. In any case it is not stressed, thus underlining the inclusivist dimension of the text which stops short of a fully universalist eschatology.

(d) The participation of human and non-human creation in the eschatological future is also presupposed in a number of hymnic and liturgical texts which combine a theocentric perspective with the idea of creation unified in the acknowledgement and/or praise of God. In these texts the manifestation of the glory of God is understood as the goal and end of creation<sup>38</sup>. The only adequate response of creation to the revelation of God’s glory is the worshipful acknowledgement of Him who is<sup>39</sup>.

The destination of humans according to 1QH<sup>a</sup> 9:29-33 is the worship of God. To this end they are endowed with God’s ultimate act of creation, the gift of language. This gift serves “to show your glory and recount your wonders, in all the deeds of your truth and your just judg[ments], to praise your name through the mouth of all (בפה כול). And they will know you according to their intellect and they will bless you for [everlasting] centuries” (9:31-33)<sup>40</sup>. כול

(Darmstadt: WBG, <sup>4</sup>1986), 15; Lange, *Weisheit*, 161, who all favor a partitive reading (“einige aus den Menschenkindern” or likewise). For arguments supporting the majority reading of מבני איש, cf. Holtz, *Gott*, 121-22, n. 169.

<sup>35</sup> Stegemann, “Textbestand,” 173.

<sup>36</sup> For details cf. Stegemann, “Textbestand,” 118-19.

<sup>37</sup> For similar hopes for the transformation of human and cosmic reality cf. 4QH<sup>a</sup> 7 ii 3-7 par.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. D. J. Harrington, “Creation,” *EDSS* 1:155: “the goal or end of creation is the glory of God”.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. 1QH<sup>a</sup> 9:29-33 ([עד] וברכוכה לעולמי [עד]; 9:32-33 [= 1QH<sup>a</sup>9:30-31 according to the reading of García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 160]; see below n. 40); 1QH<sup>a</sup> 19:25-30 (ידעו כול גוים) (בפי כולם יהולל שמכה לעולמי עד יברכוכה בפי שכל[...]) (19:27-29); 1QH<sup>a</sup> 14:13-15 (שהגוים לעיני); 1QH<sup>a</sup> 7:30-34 (לדעת כול את כבודך ואת כוחך הגדול) (115); 1QH<sup>a</sup> 7:30-34 (שהגוים); 11:15).

<sup>40</sup> For the second part of text see fn 39. This translation follows the reading of García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 160, which is in line with the reading established by E. L. Sukenik, *DSSHU*, col. 1:30-31. The reading of Schuller, *DJD* 40, is: [עד] וברכוכה לעולמי [עד] (9:32-33). The first reading clearly implies the praise of God by all creation whereas the second one seems to restrict the praise to those who know God, a group smaller than “all”. Three arguments, however, support the first reading. (1) The evidence of the manuscript allows for both readings since in 1QH<sup>a</sup> the letters ו and י are identical. The first word in question, יודעיה or וידעיה, is clearly to be discerned whereas the first letters of the second word, וברכוכה or

refers here to human and non-human creation<sup>41</sup>. The universality of the praise of God makes it clear that the author does not describe a present reality, but a hope which he expects will materialize at the end of time.

Some of the texts give a reason for the future worship of God by his creatures. In 1QH<sup>a</sup> 19:25-30 the argument is soteriological. The eschatological transformation of creation, that is, the overcoming of injustice, disease, anguish, and sighing, makes all the works of God (כול מעשיכה; 19:27) join in his praise: "In the mouth of them all is your name praised forever and ever" (בפי כולם יהולל שמכה לעולמי עד; 19:27-28). In 1QH<sup>a</sup> 7:30-34 and 1QM 11:13-15 the emphasis is on the eschatological manifestation of the righteousness of God which, obscured in the course of history, becomes visible to the whole of creation at the day of judgment when He destroys evil. In 1QM 11:13-15<sup>42</sup> the nations are expressly included in the acknowledgement of God following upon his eschatological manifestation. The "[ene]mies of all the countries" (11:13), that is the armies of the Kittim, will be given into the hands of the Community. This judgment of the universal enemy leads to the acknowledgement of God both by Israel (עם; 11:14) and the (large?) remainder of the peoples (שאר הגוים; 11:15)<sup>43</sup>.

It is, in other words, the eschatological self-manifestation of God in salvation and judgment which necessitates the universal praise of God transcending any of the divisions characteristic of creation in historical time. Creation in the texts just discussed includes non-human and human creation. 1QM 11, which most strongly emphasizes the concept of judgment as destruction, at the same time points out that the part of humankind to be annihilated is limited to a power hostile even to the nations themselves. Liberated from the common enemy, they, too, will acknowledge the greatness of God.

יברוכה, are somewhat unclear. In any case, no text critical conclusions can be drawn from the second word. 2) The horizon of 1QH<sup>a</sup> 9 is humankind as part of the wider creation. To humans as such language is given in order that they may make known the glory of God (להודיע כבודכה) and recount his wonders. This universal proclamation is to be matched by a universal response in terms of acknowledging and blessing God. A partial acknowledgement of God by one human group only, his יודעים would be anti-climactic for language has been given to all humans for proclamation, praise, and acknowledgement alike. See also M. Mansoor, *The Thanksgiving Hymns* (STDJ 3; Leiden: Brill, 1961, 103, n. 6: "While all may praise God, their knowledge and understanding of Him varies with individual insight". (3) Two texts closely related to 1QH 9 show a universal dimension as well. In terms of strong similarities in language 1QH<sup>a</sup> 19:27-28 is to be compared; cf. n. 39. The second text, 1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:27-33, is linked by a number of motifs with 1QH<sup>a</sup> 9; cf. esp. 9:26-27/12:30-32 and 9:32-34/12:31-33. As in 1QH<sup>a</sup> 9 the text 1QH<sup>a</sup> 12 is concerned with humans as such (especially to be compared is 12:30-32 where both אנוש and בן אדם are used twice). Consequently, God aims at the acknowledgement of his power by all his creatures למען ידעו כול מעשיו בכוח גבורתו 12:33).

<sup>41</sup> Cf. H. Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde* (StUNT 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1980), 166.

<sup>42</sup> This text is part of the later version of M which dates from the end of the 1st century B.C.E. or the early 1st century C.E.; cf. P.R. Davies, "War Rule," *ABD* 6:876, and similarly, Lange and Lichtenberger, *TRE* 28:61. 1QM 11:13-15 forms part of the second section of 1QM (cols 10-14) which "contains various liturgical pieces juxtaposed without any explicit rationale". Since they "are originally quite independent and indeed quite varied in theme and ideology" (Davies, *ABD* 6:875) nothing much can be said about their date of origin.

<sup>43</sup> For an additional text cf. the strongly fragmentary text 4QBer<sup>a,b</sup>. In historical time the future worship of God by the whole of creation, the inanimate (4QBer<sup>a</sup> 3 4-5; 5 2-8, 10-11) and the animate (5 1; 4QBer<sup>b</sup> 3 2-4), is anticipated in the liturgy of the Community. For the eschatological dimension of 4QBer see B. Nitzan, "The Textual, Literary and Religious Character of 4QBerakhot (4Q286-90)," 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), 654, and Holtz, *Gott*, 132-33, n. 221.

Thus, inclusive eschatological tendencies are seen in most of the literary genres extant in Qumran literature, in the pesharim (4QpNah; 4QFlor), the serakhim (1QS; 1QSa; 1QM), in the halakhic text 4QMMT, and in poetical and liturgical texts (1QSB; 1QH<sup>a</sup>; 4QSM 8 1-11). The majority of the texts discussed go back to the early period of the Qumran Community, some even are judged to be pre-Essene. This seems to indicate that inclusive eschatological tendencies were strongest in the beginnings of the Community. But the issue is more complicated. For one, 4QpNah, 4QpFlor and 1QM xi date from the 3rd to the 1st quarters of the 1st century B.C.E. And secondly, two pre-Essene texts, 1QS 4 and 4QSM 8 1-11, were included in later works which means that even in later periods of the history of the Community these texts were regarded as worth of being transmitted. Both arguments, genre as well as time of origin and transmission, underline that in Qumran thought inclusive eschatological tendencies were more widespread than is generally assumed.

As regards contents, the passages discussed demonstrate that in Qumran literature there is a wide range of eschatological perspectives for those who are not members of the Qumran Community. Messianic redemption for the Qumranites is not in each and every case “theirs and theirs alone”. L. H. Schiffman is certainly right in pointing out that the Community, as differentiated from the Pharisees and the Rabbis, did not anticipate that “all the nations would one day come to worship God under Israel’s leadership . . . at Israel’s holy mountain”<sup>44</sup>. This, however, does not mean that the non-Essene world does not have any part at all in the eschatological hope of the Community. As seen, it just took different shape. The subdivisions characteristic of humankind in historical time become blurred in the light of the final transformation of creation and God’s eschatological self-manifestation (c, d). In some of the texts the former differentiations of humankind are still remembered, but are stripped of their importance in view of the new reality of humankind which finally lives up to its destination, that is, to the acknowledgement of the glory of God. This is to say that, not only those texts which explicitly include non-Essene Israel and the nations in their hopes (a, b) are to be taken to represent the inclusivist strand of Qumran literature, but also those texts which are concerned with the future transformation of creation and the universal acknowledgement and praise of God (c, d).

## **2. Inclusivist Aspects of the Self-understanding of the Community in Historical Time**

A thorough reading of the Qumran texts clearly shows that the Qumran Community as represented by its different subgroups in various ways opens up to the outside world. In the non-eschatological parts of the D (CD/4QD)- and S (1QS/4QS)-traditions a large number of references to the coming in of new members to the Community is to be found. There is a specific terminology describing this process among which the terms “come” (לבוֹא), “bring

---

<sup>44</sup> Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 384.

in” (להביא) and “cross over” (לעבור)<sup>45</sup> figure most prominently<sup>46</sup>. Moreover, the importance the Qumran Community attaches to incorporating new members is indicated by the various passages dealing with the admittance of newcomers<sup>47</sup>. Since they belong to different phases of the history of the Community as made up of different groups<sup>48</sup>, it is clear that the topic was of permanent interest to the Qumranites. Finally, it may be noted that the importance of incorporating new members can be seen from the fact that the admission process is in the hands of a leading figure, the *maskil*<sup>49</sup>, the *paqid*<sup>50</sup>, or the *mevaqer*<sup>51</sup>, of the Community<sup>52</sup>. Apart from these rather general remarks it is the concept of the covenant which specifically attests to the opening up of the Qumran Community. “Covenant” (ברית) is one of the terms used by the Community as self-designation<sup>53</sup>. In the present context it holds a key position because the relationship of the Community to the outside world is strongly defined by this term. This relationship can briefly be described as one of reaching out and, at the same time, of keeping apart. The exclusiveness of the covenant in Qumran literature is obvious<sup>54</sup>. Of no less importance, however, is its inclusivist dimension. The D-tradition on the one hand and

---

<sup>45</sup> For references to לבוא or להביא in connection with ברית cf. 1QS 1:7; 2:12, 18, 25-26; 5:8, 20; 6:14-15; 10:10; CD 2:2; 3:10; 4:7; 6:11, 19; 8:1, 21; 9:2-3; 12:11; 13:14; 15:5; 19:13-14, 16, 33; 20:25; for לבוא in connection with היחד or בסרך היחד or בעצת היחד cf. 1QS 1:16; 3:2; 5:7; see further 1QS 8:21 (עצת הקודש). For לבוא (qal and hifil) in connection with העדה cf. CD 13:13; 14:10; 20:2. For לעבור ברית cf. 1QS 1:16, 18, 20, 24; 2:10; CD 1:20; for לעבור בסרך cf. 1QS 2:19-20; for לעבור על הפקודים cf. CD 10:1-2; 15:6. C. A. Evans, “Covenant in the Qumran Literature,” in *Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*, 63, points out that the terms בוא and עבר are “reminiscent of the tradition of Israel crossing the Jordan River and entering the Promised Land”. The purpose of entering the Community, then, is not only negatively “to escape damnation, but (positively) to take possession of what God has promised”.

<sup>46</sup> Further cf. 1QS 5:7 (אסף; see also 1QSa 1:1); 1QS 6:14; 8:19 (יסף; see also 4Q265 4 ii 3); 1QS 5:7 par 4QS<sup>b,d</sup>; CD 4:3 (לוה).

<sup>47</sup> Cf. CD 15:5-16:2; 1QS 1:16-2:25; 5:7-10, 20-24; 6:13-23. These texts sometimes strongly differ; cf. C. Hempel, “Community Structures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Admission, Organization, Disciplinary Procedures,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; vol. 2, Leiden: Brill, 1999), 70-73. For further literature see *ibid.*, 70, n. 9.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Hempel, “Community Structures,” 72.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. 1QS 1:7-8: “in order to welcome all those who freely volunteer to carry out God’s decrees into the covenant of kindness” (ולהבי את כול הנדבים לעשות חוקי אל בברית חסד).

<sup>50</sup> Cf. 1QS 6:13-15: After testing the applicant with regard to his insights and deeds the *paqid* “shall let him enter into the covenant” in case “he suits the discipline” (יביאהו בברית).

<sup>51</sup> According to CD 13:11-13 the ordinary members of the Community do not have “authority to introduce anyone into the congregation without the permission of the Inspector of the camp” (להביא איש אל העדה זולת פי) (המבקר אשר למחנה).

<sup>52</sup> For these different functions cf., e.g., Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 121-25; R. A. Kugler 1999, “Priesthood at Qumran,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years*, 106-8; S. Metso, “Qumran Community Structure and Terminology as Theological Statement,” *RevQ* 20 (2002), 438-40; C. Murphy, *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community* (STDJ 40; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 373-79.

<sup>53</sup> For further terms cf. A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat<sup>a,b</sup>)* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 163-67, and Metso, “Qumran Community Structure,” 431-37.

<sup>54</sup> For the exclusivist dimension of the covenant in the S-tradition cf. 1QS 1:16-2:18 and 5:1-20 par 4QS<sup>b</sup> 9:1-13; 4QS<sup>d</sup> 1:1-11. This dimension becomes especially clear by comparing 1QS 5 with the original form of the S-tradition as preserved in 4QS<sup>b,d</sup>; cf. Holtz, *Gott*, 332-35. In the D-tradition the exclusiveness of the covenant is connected with the term גבול (boundary) etc. (4QD<sup>a</sup> 1a-b 4; 11 12; CD 1:16; 5:20; 19:16); for further passages stressing the exclusive dimension see esp. CD 4:12-5:15; 6:11-7:9. For a detailed argumentation cf. Holtz, *Gott*, 340-43.

the S-tradition on the other thereby stress two different aspects. This is to be demonstrated in the following:

(a) The pan-Jewish dimension of the covenant appears in all parts of the D-manuscripts<sup>55</sup>. It is seen in the hortatory preface and conclusion of D, as well as in the central middle section of the work, the legal corpus<sup>56</sup>.

Expressing the D-tradition's fundamental understanding of the covenant, it states in CD 3:12-14: "But with those who remained steadfast in God's precepts, with those who were left from among them, God established his covenant for Israel (בריתו לישראל)<sup>57</sup> for ever, revealing to them hidden matters in which all Israel (כול ישראל) had gone astray". Those who remained steadfast and with whom God therefore established his covenant are the members of the predecessor community<sup>58</sup>. This covenant, however, is not limited to this group, but rather is a "covenant for Israel". In accordance with the predominant usage of the term in CD, Israel here means Israel as a whole<sup>59</sup>. The "covenant for Israel," in other words, is the covenant for "all Israel," for those who had deserted God's covenant (3:11), and for the law-abiding members of the predecessor community who, before the establishment of the covenant in their midst, had, just as Israel at large, gone astray in the specific laws later on revealed to them, especially sabbaths and feasts (3:14-15).

The all-Israel dimension of the covenant in the D-tradition is most clearly brought out in the law section of D, namely in the passage CD 15:5-16:6 par 4QD, which deals with the admission of new members to the Covenant Community. כ[ן] ל ישראל or ישראל here is mentioned thrice. The passage is the opening of an extensive law section dealing with the Community and life therein as envisioned by D. It is preceded by a short passage on the swearing in the name of God only, that is, a topic concerned with the relationship between God and humans (15:1-5). The position of CD 15:5-16:6 right at the beginning of the community-related law points to the importance of the passage<sup>60</sup>.

In the introduction to the admission laws the very covenant whose rules and regulations are listed afterwards is defined as ברית לכל ישראל (15:5). The new members of the Community,

---

<sup>55</sup> For the all-Jewish orientation of the concept of the covenant in CD see also J. Christiansen, "The Consciousness of Belonging to God's Covenant and What it Entails According to the Damascus Document and the Community Rule," in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments* (ed. F. H. Cryer and T. L. Thompson; JSOT.S 290; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1998), 73, 84, 96-97.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. J. M. Baumgarten, *DJD* 18:7.

<sup>57</sup> García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 555, translate instead: ". . . God established his covenant with Israel...". This translation levels the difference of prepositions of the Hebrew text; cf. במחוקים במצות אל on the one hand and לישראל on the other. But cf. Lohse, *Texte*, 71; Maier, *Qumran-Essener*, 1:12. See also L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (vol. 1; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 158 s.v. ברית. C.a.2.3, who render ל in connection with the establishment of the covenant as "for the benefit of".

<sup>58</sup> For this group see H. Lichtenberger, "Alter Bund und Neuer Bund," *NTS* 41 (1995), 404-5.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. 3:14; 12:8, 19, 22; 13:20; 15:5, 9; 16:1, 3; 20:26. Israel as a historical (mostly biblical) entity is in view in CD 1:3, 5, 7; 2:9; 5:19, 20; 6:1; 7:12, 20. In CD 10:5; 13:1; 14:19; 16:14; 19:11; 20:1 the lay part of the Jewish people in contrast to the priests (and Levites) is meant; the main point is genealogy, not group affiliation. A part of all Israel - this is either expressed by a preposition (מן; ב) or a constructus-form - is meant in 1:7; 6:2-3; 8:16 (predecessor Community) and in 4:3-4 (Qumran Community). Non-Essene Judaism is probably meant in 1:14; 4:13, 16; 7:18 and 20:16. But cf. Metso, "Qumran Community Structure," 436-37.

<sup>60</sup> The original sequence of the laws of the D-tradition seems to have been CD 15-16; 9-14 par; cf. C. Hempel, *The Damascus Texts* (CQuS 1; Sheffield: Academic Press, 2000), 19.

then, do not enter just any one group in Israel but the covenant which is aimed at all (כל) Israel<sup>61</sup>. The fundamental openness of the covenant to all Israel is also seen immediately afterwards. Not only the adult sons of the Community are to join it by taking the oath of the covenant, but also “whoever reverts (כל השב; 15:7) from his path of corruption”. Admission is not linked to genealogy, but to the willingness of each and everyone in Israel to live according to the rules and regulations of the Community. The all-Israel dimension of the covenant is further indicated by the specifications of the term “oath of covenant” in 15:8-9. Here it says: “they shall enrol him with the oath of the covenant which Moses established with Israel (אשר כרת משה עם ישראל) the covenant to rev[ert to] the law of Moses (תורת משה) . . .”. The oath of the Community, which is identical with the oath of Mose’s covenant, is the connecting link between the present “covenant for all Israel” (15:5) and the “covenant which Moses established with Israel”. The latter expression not only attests to the continuity between the two covenants<sup>62</sup>, but thereby to the pan-Israelite character of the present covenant as well, for “the covenant which Moses established with Israel” per definitionem is the covenant with the people of Israel as a whole and not just a group<sup>63</sup>. The present covenant is clearly pan-Israelite as to contents as well. It is the Torah of Moses to which, in the self-understanding of the Covenant Community, of course, the newcomers are to revert. Towards the end of CD 15:5-16:6 Israel at large is mentioned once more. In the fragmentary text CD 15:17-20; 16:1-2 par 4QD<sup>f</sup> 4 ii 1-4 the future covenant which God is to conclude “[with the house of Israel and the house of Judah]” - in view is the covenant of the Community - is connected with Moses. “(A)bout th[is] cov[e]nant” God “[through Moses]” is to have said: “[In accor]dance with these w[ord]s I established with you a covenant and with all Israel (כול ישראל) כרתי עמכם ברית ועם כול ישראל) (Ex 34,27)” (4QD<sup>f</sup> ii 1-3/CD 16:1). Over against the Masoretic text the word “all” (כול) is added<sup>64</sup>. The author apparently wishes once more to emphasize that the present covenant is a covenant for all Israel. For this claim to be realized, each and every Israelite must necessarily join the Community: “Therefore (על כן), each man (האיש) has to impose upon himself to return to the Torah of Moses, for in it all is defined” (16:1-2)<sup>65</sup>. Even though the referenced Torah of Moses obviously is the Torah as interpreted by the Covenant Community<sup>66</sup>, CD wishes to underline the pan-Israelite claim of the Qumran covenant and the law therein in force. Of course, there is a gap between ideal and reality. The decisive point, however, is that according to the self-understanding of the Community this gap has to be bridged and can be bridged.

---

<sup>61</sup> See also Hempel, *Laws*, 88, who judges that “Israel at large” in CD 15:5-16:2 is seen “in a neutral, if not positive manner”.

<sup>62</sup> The basic form of the covenant is the covenant with the patriarchs which is renewed at various stages of the history of Israel; among these renewals are the covenant at Sinai (CD 3:10-11), the acquisition of the land (CD 8:14-15), and the covenant with the predecessor community (CD 3:13; 8:17-18); cf. Holtz, *Gott*, 313-18.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. CD 3:5-12; esp. 3:10-11.

<sup>64</sup> Ex 34,27 MT says: כרתי אתך ברית ואת־ישראל.

<sup>65</sup> In connection with the expression כול ישראל, which immediately precedes, הואיש is to be taken generically; for this use of the article cf. W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch and G. Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik* (Darmstadt: WBG, 1991), 425, 3.l.m. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 565, translate: “one” instead. Since the covenant is a covenant for all Israel, הואיש, of course, is restricted to the Israelite framework.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. CD 16:2-4 where the issue of holy times is mentioned.

The pan-Israelite intention of the covenant is further attested to by three passages in 4QD, which form part of the hortatory conclusion. The first text, 4QD<sup>a</sup> 11 9-14, is a blessing to be said by the leading priest as part of the expulsion ritual performed at the annual covenant renewal ceremony. Although the term “covenant” is not used, covenant language still dominates<sup>67</sup>. The b<sup>ᵛ</sup>racha begins with the praise of the majesty of God: “Blessed are you, who art everything, in your hands is everything, you do everything”. The greatness of God is then unfolded in terms of his dealings with humankind. It basically consists of two parts, the nations (עמים; 11 10) on the one hand and Israel on the other. Although the term “Israel” is not used, the terms “our fathers” (אבותינו) and “their descendants” (זרעם; 11 11) clearly represent Israel at large<sup>68</sup>. In the blessing, God is said to have founded the nations in their different subdivisions and then to have led them astray (11 10-11). Accordingly, it is none other than God himself who caused the aberration of the nations. In contrast, God “chose the fathers and gave to their descendants (זרעם)” the precepts which, if practiced, promise life. There is one more statement related to Israel at large: “And you established frontiers for us” (וגבולות הגבלתה לנו; 11 12-13), that is, the law. Only then is Israel further differentiated, but not, as is the case with Israel and the nations, by God, but by the individual Israelites. They either transgress the frontiers established with the consequence of their being accursed, or they respect them and thus become “the people of your ransom” (ואנו עם פדותכה; 11 13), that is, the Community. The covenant as circumscribed by its frontiers is meant for all the descendants of the fathers and its norms are binding on all, but not all of them remain within its limits. Thus, it is not the range of the covenant that is exclusivist, but the individualization of blessing and curse on the basis of obedience and transgression.

Concerning the Law, 4QD<sup>c</sup> 7 ii 12-15 par 4QD<sup>a</sup> on principle agrees with the foregoing. The Community’s interpretation of the Law (פרוש המשפטים לנו; ii 12), as laid down in D, is judged as the final and the last (מדרש [ה]תורת האחרון; ii 15). As such it is binding on all Israel. Or, as H. K. Harrington puts it, “the laws of the Damascus Document are considered by the author as applicable to all Jews wherever they might live in the land of Israel”<sup>69</sup>.

Accordingly, several appeals to revert to and accept the one true Torah of Israel are to be found in the D-tradition. Concerning those members of the Covenant Community who sin unintentionally, 4QD<sup>c</sup> 7 i 15-21 par 4QD<sup>a</sup> 11 1-7 states that the acceptance of the penalties of the Community is the fully valid equivalent to a sin-offering in the temple (i 15-17). In contrast, for Israel at large there is no atonement. To her, Lev 26,31 is applied: “I shall go to the edges of hea[vens, and I shall not smell the aroma of] your [ple]asant fragrances” (i 17-18)<sup>70</sup>. However, God’s self-isolation from Israel as expressed in this verse is not

---

<sup>67</sup> In 4QD<sup>a</sup> 11 11-13 some of the fundamentals of the covenant are mentioned: the election of the fathers, the giving of the law to their descendants, the promise of life to those who keep the law, and the threat of curse on those who transgress.

<sup>68</sup> For that זרע refers to Israel as a whole and not to the Community of D two arguments can be adduced: In 4QD<sup>a</sup> 11 10-11 אבותינו and זרעם are jointly opposed to עמים. Besides, the usage of זרע in CD/4QD points to this interpretation; cf. CD 12:21-22 (זרע ישראל) preceded by כל חי [12:20]; 13:20 par 4QD<sup>a</sup> 9 iii 11.

<sup>69</sup> H. K. Harrington, “Biblical Law at Qumran,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years*, 165.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. J. M. Baumgarten, “A ‘Scriptural’ Citation in 4Q Fragments of the Damascus Document,” *JJS* 43 (1992), 96-97.

unredeemable. Connected with the quotation from Lev 26 by “and in ano[ther place it is written]” (ובמקום אחר כתוב) (i 18), the author adds two quotations from the book of Joel: “‘Tear your heart and not your clothes’ and it is writt[en...: to return (לשוב) to God in tears and in fasting]”<sup>71</sup>. The gates of repentance for Israel at large are open. The non-members of the Community are expressly invited to repent and return to God which here, of course, means to join the Community.

The inclusivist intention of the D-Community is similarly to be seen in CD 2:14-6:11<sup>72</sup>. Two arguments have been adduced: (1) In 4:9-10 forgiveness of sin is also promised to those who did not yet belong to the predecessor community but only later joined the group. Implicitly this statement is to be understood as an invitation to the addressees to join the Community and thus to secure for themselves the forgiveness of sin and eternal life<sup>73</sup>. At the same time they are made aware that the time to join is running out (4:10-12). Similarly, this statement is taken as an invitation to grasp the opportunity and join the Covenant Community at the earliest<sup>74</sup>. (2) In CD 5:11-15, the opponents of the Community are quoted with a statement “against the statutes of God’s covenant” (חוקי ברית אל), saying: “‘they are unfounded’” (לא נכונו; 5:12). M. Knibb understands this to mean “that at least at the time to which this material refers, there was some public knowledge of Essene beliefs and perhaps an open attempt to win converts”<sup>75</sup>. This attempt seems to have taken place in an atmosphere of competing claims to truth. For according to CD 5:13-15 not only the Qumranites tried to win over new adherents, but also their opponents<sup>76</sup>.

The arguments presented, which are derived from a literary-theological analysis of the D-tradition, concur with major results of the historically oriented research of H. Stegemann, for whom the self-understanding of the Teacher of Righteousness was to unite all Israel in a union (יחד). Moreover, Stegemann is of the opinion that the successors of the Teacher maintained the pan-Israelite claim of the covenant<sup>77</sup>.

---

<sup>71</sup> The first quotation, Joel 2,13, is preserved in 4QD<sup>a</sup> as well as in 4QD<sup>e</sup> whereas the second one, Joel 2,12, is clearly identifiable only in 4QD<sup>a</sup> where it is written above the main line. Joel 2,12, however, also seems to have formed part of 4QD<sup>e</sup>; cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 617.

<sup>72</sup> The inclusivist dimension of this section is observed by several authors. Cf. S. Iwry, “Was There a Migration to Damascus? The Problem of ששבי ישראל,” in *Eretz Israel* 9 (1969) (=Albright Volume), 83, and J. Murphy-O’Connor, “An Essene Missionary Document? CD II,14-VI,1,” *RB* 77 (1970), 205, who qualify this text as “missionary”. Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 27-28, views it as “perhaps originally intended for the instruction of those on the verge of joining the movement or of members who had just joined”. Similarly, P.R. Davies, “Who Can Join the ‘Damascus Covenant’?,” *JJS* 46 (1995), 137, classifies the Community “not as a reclusive but as an actively proselytizing one”.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 38; similarly, Murphy-O’Connor, “Essene Missionary Document,” 217.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Murphy-O’Connor, “Essene Missionary Document,” 217-19, and Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 38.

<sup>75</sup> Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 44; also see Murphy-O’Connor, “Essene Missionary Document,” 222-23. The attempt to win new adherents does not seem to have been limited to a specific time in the history of the D-Community, for a rather late passage of D, 4QD<sup>e</sup> 7 i 15-21, as well attests to the continued hope that non-Essenes might revert.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. the expression “(w)hoever comes close to them” (הקרוב אליהם); 5:14), which implies that there must have been persons who joined the opponents. CD even goes so far as to accuse the opponents of pressurizing (נחלץ); 5:15) potential new adherents of the Covenant Community.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. Stegemann, “Qumran Essenes,” 154-55, and idem, *Essener*, 229-31. This claim is further substantiated by far-reaching conceptual continuities with Old Testament and apocryphal understandings of the covenant. Cf. B. Nitzan, “The Concept of the Covenant in Qumran Literature,” in *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. D. Goodblatt et al.; STDJ 37; Leiden: Brill,



of the covenant, whereas the oldest, presumably pre-Essene section of the S-tradition as well as 1QSa point to the soteriological relevance of the Community for all Israel.

### 3. The Legal Evidence

In this final section the main thesis of this paper is verified in the wider field of Qumran law. In a number of legal texts the relationship between the members of the Qumran Community and the outside world as constituted by specific sociological groups is defined. Six groups emerge: former members of the Community, meanwhile expelled; apostates; the explicit opponents of the Community, mostly called “men of injustice” (אנשי העויל); the socially weak segment of the Jewish society; proselytes or non-Jews approaching Judaism; and non-Jews. As can easily be seen, such an entity as “all Israel” or the like is missing. Even though the non-Essene Jewish society at times is strongly attacked, no law can be found that demands the separation from “all Israel”. Especially instructive is the case of CD 4:12-5:15 with its fierce polemic against the “three nets of Belial” (4:15), namely, fornication, wealth, and the defilement of the temple (4:17-18). This text, however, does not have the binding force of a legal text.

From among the six groups mentioned, the Qumranites are to relate to two: to the weak and poor in Israel and to the proselytes (a), but they are to keep away from the other groups: three Jewish groups (b) as well as the nations (c).

(a) The support of the poor and the weak in general is mentioned in two laws. According to CD 6:14-17 the Qumranites are “to abstain from wicked wealth which defiles, either by promise or by vow, and from the wealth of the temple (for) they (sc. the sons of the pit) steal from the poor of his people<sup>85</sup>, making widows their spoils and murdering orphans”. The welfare of the poor here is not part of the legal formulation itself<sup>86</sup>, but is implied in the reasoning given. In terms of a positive law the support of the marginalized, however, is demanded in CD 6:21: “to strengthen the hand of the poor, the needy, and the proselyte”<sup>87</sup>. There are reasons to assume that the laws collected in the passage CD 14:14-16, which takes up the wording CD 6:21 and expands upon it, originally also had the poor and disadvantaged in general in view<sup>88</sup>. Apart from CD 6:21 there are two more texts which aim at the protection of the proselyte, or the person in the process of conversion. The foreigner (בני נכר) is prohibited to work on the Sabbath day (9:2), and the Qumranites are forbidden to sell those servants who “entered the covenant of Abraham with him” (12:10-11) so as to make sure that they are not prevented from doing the law<sup>89</sup>. The passages mentioned concerning

---

<sup>85</sup> For the rendering of עמו את עניי עמו as a causal clause cf. J. M. Baumgarten and D. Schwartz, *PTSDSSP*, 2:23. ירצחו ... לגזול combines two biblical verses, Jes 10,2 and Ps 94,6. This probably accounts for the syntactic difficulties.

<sup>86</sup> For the exact meaning of the law itself cf. Baumgarten and Schwartz, *PTSDSSP*, 2:23.

<sup>87</sup> García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 559, render gr with “foreigner”; but see below n. 90.

<sup>88</sup> For a detailed argumentation cf. Holtz, *Gott*, 364-66.

<sup>89</sup> A further law concerning proselytes is perhaps 4QMMT<sup>c</sup> 4:9-11 (=B80ff), which according to C. E. Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Inter-marriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud* (Oxford: University Press, 2002), 82-86, prohibits marriages between Jews and proselytes. Such a union, however, is also prohibited in Rabbinic law - cf. J. M. Baumgarten, “The Exclusion of ‘Netinim’ and Proselytes in 4Q Florilegium,” *RevQ* 8 (1972/75), 92-94 - and therefore not specific to the Qumran-Essene form of Judaism.

the proselyte moreover indicate that the Community apparently was willing to accept ethnic non-Jews in their ranks<sup>90</sup>.

(b) In strictly legal terms the Qumranites are demanded to separate from three Jewish groups<sup>91</sup>: from those expelled from the Community, from the apostates, and from the group of “the men of injustice” (אנשי העויל) who seem to be identical with “the men of the pit” (אנשי ההשחת), or with “the men of deceit” (אנשי הרמיה)<sup>92</sup>. As C. Hempel has shown, the latter “group is very closely associated with the emergence of a community, its self-definition in terms of halakhah, purity and economy. Despite the repeated calls for separation from this group, its closeness to the community is at times so pronounced, that the issues raised such as authority and touching the purity would only be conceivable if this group were considered by some as belonging to the community, as being ‘one of them’”<sup>93</sup>. Hempel’s argument is further supported by the fact that the specific forms of separation mentioned with regard to the “men of injustice”, etc., coincide with those forms demanded from the Qumranites in relation to the expelled and the apostates, that is, with those two groups whose members originally were so close to the Qumranites that they even formed part of their movement. As different from relations with the “men of injustice”, etc., contacts of Qumranites with expelled members or apostates, however, are expressly punished by the expulsion of the Community member engaged in such relations<sup>94</sup>.

Apart from the general rule “to keep apart from all the men of injustice”<sup>95</sup>, several specific areas of separation are mentioned, most of which are to be found in relation to the expelled and/or the apostates as well. Forbidden contacts are related to work (עבודה<sup>96</sup>), property (הון<sup>97</sup>), the interpretation of the law<sup>98</sup>, authority<sup>99</sup>, purity (טהרה<sup>100</sup>), and non-monetary

---

<sup>90</sup> Cf. further CD 14:4, 6 par 4QD<sup>b</sup> 9 v 9-10. Whereas P. R. Davies, “‘Damascus Covenant’,” 136; idem, *Sects and Scrolls: Essays on Qumran and Related Topics* (SFSHJ 134; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 167-68, understands the gr in CD 14 as a Jew joining the Qumran Community, others rightly identify him as a non-Jew; cf. Stegemann, “Qumran Essenes,” 137; A. Shemesh, “‘The Holy Angels Are in Their Council’: The Exclusion of Deformed Persons from Holy Places in Qumranic and Rabbinic Literature,” *DSD* 4 (1997), 198-99, and Hempel, *Laws*, 135.

<sup>91</sup> For a detailed discussion of the pertinent laws cf. Holtz, *Gott*, 357-63.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. C. Hempel, “The Community and its Rivals According to the Community Rule from Caves 1 and 4,” *RevQ* 21 (2003), 61, 64.

<sup>93</sup> Hempel, “The Community and its Rivals,” 80; see also Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 105 (“the description of them as a ‘congregation’... may indicate that a particular group is in mind”) and Davies, *Sects*, 144-45.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. 1QS 7:22-25 (apostates); 1QS 8:21-34 (expelled); CD 20:7-8 (expelled); 20:8-13 (apostates); 4QD<sup>a</sup> 11 14-15 (expelled).

<sup>95</sup> Cf. 1QS 5:10 par 4QS<sup>b</sup> 9:8 (להבדל מכול אנשי העויל) [“to separate from all the men of injustice”]; 1QS 5:1f par 4QS<sup>b</sup> 9:2 (להבדל מעדת אנשי העויל) [“to separate from the congregation of the men of injustice”]; CD 6:14-15 (להבדל מבני השחת) [“to separate from the sons of the pit”]; see further 1QS 9:20-21 (part of the teaching of the *maskil*). Cf. Hempel, “The Community and its Rivals,” 70; Holtz, *Gott*, 357-63.

<sup>96</sup> 1QS 5:14 par 4QS<sup>b</sup> 9:10-11 (men of injustice); CD 20:7 (expelled); 20:8-10 (apostates: “And [proceed] according to this judgment [וכמשפט הזה], with all those who despise . . .”).

<sup>97</sup> Cf. 1QS 5:14 par 4QS<sup>b</sup> 9:10-11 (men of injustice); 7:25 (apostate); 8:23 (expelled); 9:8 par 4QS<sup>d</sup> 7:8-9 (אנשי הרמיה [men of deceit]); CD 20:7 (expelled); 20:8-10 (apostates). See further 1QS 9:21-22 (sons of the pit).

<sup>98</sup> Cf. 1QS 5:15-16 par 4QS<sup>b</sup> 9:9-10 (תורה ומשפט) [men of injustice]; 8:23-24 (עצה [expelled]); 9:17 (עצת התורה [men of injustice]).

<sup>99</sup> Cf. 1QS 9:16-17 (men of the pit).

<sup>100</sup> Cf. 4QS<sup>b</sup> 9:8-9 par 4QS<sup>d</sup> 1:7-8 (men of injustice); 1QS 7:24-25 (apostates).

relationships<sup>101</sup>, especially common meals<sup>102</sup>. 4QD<sup>a</sup> 11 15-16 adds another two rather general forms of prohibited contacts with expelled members, that is, seeking their peace in terms of consulting their interests<sup>103</sup> and being in agreement with them.

For three of the prohibitions mentioned an explicit reasoning is given. In each case the argument given for separation is the very realm of existence of the men of injustice, that is, the realm of lie (1QS 5:15), nothingness (5:17), impurity and injustice (9:8-9).

(c) The remaining laws addressing the relationship between Qumran-Essene Judaism and the outside world concern the relations with the Gentiles. The bulk of these laws is concerned with the protection of the Jewish side. Two laws, however, are aimed at the good of the non-Jews. In this spirit CD 12:6-8 prohibits Jews “to shed the blood of one of the gentiles for the sake of riches and gain”. Neither are they to “take any of their riches, lest they blaspheme”<sup>104</sup>. As to the laws protecting the Jewish side, four intentions emerge: non-participation in idolatry<sup>105</sup>, preservation of the purity of the temple cult<sup>106</sup>, of purity of the individual<sup>107</sup>, and of national interests<sup>108</sup>.

The comparison between the laws dealing with Essene-Gentile relations and those concerned with the relationship to the men of injustice underlines the intensity of the Community’s effort to separate from the latter group. In the law sections of Qumran literature it is only the intra-Jewish opponents who are thoroughly disqualified, not the Gentiles. This intensity is

---

<sup>101</sup> Cf. 1QS 5:16-17 (men of injustice); CD 13:14-15 (men of the pit).

<sup>102</sup> Cf. 1QS 5:16-17 par 4QS<sup>b</sup> 9:9 par 4QS<sup>d</sup> 1:8 (men of injustice); 4QD<sup>a</sup> 11 14-15 (expelled).

<sup>103</sup> For this rendering of the expression וידרשו שלומם cf. J. D. M. Derrett, “The Reprobate’s Peace: 4QD<sup>a</sup> (=4Q266) (18 v 14-16),” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995* (ed. M. J. Bernstein et al.; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 247.

<sup>104</sup> The final purpose of this law, then, is the honor of God. For the historical background of these laws cf. L. H. Schiffman, “Legislation Concerning Relations with Non-Jews in the Zadokite Fragments and in Tannaitic Literature,” *RevQ* 11 (1982/84), 382-84; idem 1997, “Non-Jews in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality* (ed. C. A. Evans and S. Talmon; BIS 28; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 155-56.

<sup>105</sup> Cf. 4QMMT<sup>a</sup> 3-7 i 6-8 (=B3-5); i 8-9 (=B8-9); 4QD<sup>f</sup> 2 8-10 (for details see n. 108). Cf. further CD 12:8-9: “No one should sell clean animals or birds, to the gentiles lest they sacrifice them” as well as 12:9-10: “And he should not sell them anything from his granary or his press, at any price”; for a reasoning in terms of idolatry cf. J. M. Baumgarten, “The ‘Halakha’ in Miqṣat Ma‘aṣe ha-Torah (MMT),” *JAOS* 116 (1996), 512; Hempel, *Damascus Texts*, 79; but see Schiffman, “Legislation,” 387.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. 4QMMT<sup>a</sup> 3-7 i 6-8 (= B3-5): “. . . you shall not eat] of the wheat of [the Gen]tiles, [and it shall not] be brought into the temple”; i 11-12 (=B8-9): “And concerning the sacrifice of the Gentiles: [. . . they sacrifice] to the [. . .] it is [li]ke who whored with him”; 4QD<sup>f</sup> 2 8-10: “No-one should bring in [. . . with the blood of their sacrifice . . .] . . . in its purity, and of an[y] gold and silver [and copper and] tin and le[ad with which the gentiles make im]ages, one should only bring to [its] purit[y from the ne]w that has come from the furnace . . .”; 4QD<sup>a</sup> 5 ii 4-7: “[. . . Anyone] of the sons of Aaron who has been a captive among the gentiles [. . .] to defile it with their impurity. He should not approach the service of [. . .] from the house of the veil. And he should not eat of the [most] holy things [. . .]”. For an interpretation of the texts cited cf. Holtz, *Gott*, 367-69.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. 4QMMT<sup>a</sup> 8 iii 9-19 (=B39-49): prohibition of marriages between Jews and non-Jews; impurity is mentioned in iii 12. CD 11:14-15: “No-one <should stay> in a place close to gentiles on the sabbath”; for an interpretation in terms of purity see Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 374; idem, “Non-Jews,” 157-58.

<sup>108</sup> Cf. 4QD<sup>a</sup> 5 ii 8-9: “Whoever of the sons of Aaron emigrates to se[rve . . .] /to teach/ his people in the council of the people, and also to <betray> . . .”; 4QD<sup>e</sup> 2 ii 12-13: “[. . . And whoever] divulges the secret of his people to the pagans, or curses [his people . . .]” For an interpretation of the texts cited cf. Holtz, *Gott*, 369.

also reflected on the level of the actual laws. As compared to the laws on Essene-Gentile relations, the laws prohibiting contacts with the men of injustice are much more detailed and the specific forms of separation demanded much more fundamental. These laws primarily aim at the complete separation of the sanctioned in-group from the rival group. In contrast, the laws on Essene-Gentile relations are mainly concerned with the protection of the common religious and national pillars of Judaism and differ only in detail from the law of other Jewish groups<sup>109</sup>. It is this difference in emphasis which attests to the rigidity of the intra-Jewish laws of seclusion.

A further indication in terms of law, that the Qumran Community in its totality might not have been as reclusive as is often assumed, is found in CD 14:9-10. In this passage the “Inspector (מבקר) who is over all the camps” is demanded to be “mastering every secret of men and every language (בעול בכול סוד אנשים ולכל לשון)”. This demand, however, only makes sense if he was meant to interact with people and/or texts from the non-Hebrew world and thus to transcend the confines of his own group<sup>110</sup>.

To summarize: As regards the relationship to non-Essene Judaism, legally prohibited contacts are restricted to those three groups which originally were closely related to the Community or even formed part of it: the men of injustice, etc., apostates, and those expelled. In terms of law separation from “all Israel” or the like is not in question. This is also confirmed by the fact that Qumran law expressly demands the support of the poor and the weak in Israelite society<sup>111</sup>.

In terms of text traditions and recensions these general remarks can be further specified. With only a few exceptions the bulk of the laws of seclusion is concentrated in the S-tradition, that is in the later recension 1QS 5-9 par as well as in the earlier recensions 4QS<sup>b+d</sup><sup>112</sup>. The group the S-community is to keep apart from is mostly identified with the “men of injustice”, etc., a few times, however, with the apostates<sup>113</sup> and the expelled<sup>114</sup> as well.

In the D-tradition the picture strongly differs. In the law parts (CD 6:11-7:4; 9-16) only two laws of seclusion are found, both of which are related to the “men of the pit”. CD 6:14-15 is

---

<sup>109</sup> Cf. J. Baumgarten, “The Disqualifications of Priests in 4Q Fragments of the ‘Damascus Document,’ a Specimen of the Recovery of pre-Rabbinic Halakha,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress* (vol. 2), 513 (for 4QD<sup>a</sup> 5 ii 4-9); Schiffman, “Legislation,” 384 (for CD 12:7-8); *ibid.*, 386-87 (for CD 12:8-9). See also *idem*, “Non-Jews,” 157: “the Zadokite Fragments presents a sort of summary of what later Rabbinic tradition would enshrine in the Mishnah tractate *‘Aboda Zara*. From the point of view of the laws of the sect, we can conclude that in this area, their laws are simply a reflection of those followed by a number of Jewish groups, including the Pharisees, the forerunners of the Tannaim”.

<sup>110</sup> I thank Prof. Dr. H. Lichtenberger, Tübingen, for drawing my attention to this text.

<sup>111</sup> In this Qumran law shows the same attitude as do other strands of Jewish law; cf. Holtz, *Gott*, 365-66. The same is true of the laws discussed concerning proselytes - cf. Baumgarten, “Exclusion,” 95-96; G. Blidstein, “4Q Florilegium and Rabbinic Sources on Bastard and Proselyte,” *RevQ* 8 (1972/75), 431-35; Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 383, and Shemesh, “Origins,” 199, - and, as noted, the non-Jewish world. All this points to the fact that for the Qumranites not Judaism as such was the real opponent but the three groups specified.

<sup>112</sup> Cf. n. 95-103.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. n. 97; 100.

<sup>114</sup> Cf. n. 97; 98.

a general formulation whereas CD 13:14-15 specifies the separation from the opponents in terms of non-monetary relationships. Both texts have parallels in 1QS<sup>115</sup>. The remaining laws of separation in the D-tradition are found in later layers only, that is in CD 20:7-10, which is part of the Admonition, and in 4QD<sup>a</sup> 11 14-16<sup>116</sup>. These laws, however, are not related to the “men of the pit” but to the expelled or apostates. The issues to which they refer - namely work, property, and common meals - are taken up in the S-tradition as well<sup>117</sup>. With the exception of 1QS 7:25 and 8:23, where they are set against the apostates and the expelled, the S-tradition, however, relates them to the “men of injustice”, etc. That is, in the earlier parts of the D-tradition laws of seclusion are hardly to be found; only after the death of the Teacher they become more dominant. As contrary to the early parts of D, in the later ones the opponents in view are not the “men of the pit”, i.e. an external group, but the apostates and expelled, who used to be part of the in-group.

In view of the textual and chronological evidence given it seems quite clear that the differences between S and D concerning separation are hardly to be explained by chronology, i.e. historical development, but rather have to be attributed to the differences between the communities behind the texts<sup>118</sup>. For the community behind S separation from groups originally closely related to it is central, for the community behind D, at least before the death of the Teacher, it was one issue among others<sup>119</sup>.

On the basis of the texts discussed (2; 3) it is possible to further characterize the communities behind S and D. The community of D perceives itself as part of Israel, and hence undertakes it to define its relationship to Israel in her different dimensions, i.e. to Israel as a whole in her theological dimension as people of God (2a), to contemporary non-Essene Judaism (CD 4:12-5:15), to specific groups therein (3a, b), and to entities related to her, namely to the proselytes (3a) and the nations (3c). As to the poor, the proselytes, and the nations, the attitude displayed in the D-tradition is similar to that of other strands of Jewish law<sup>120</sup>. Strong disagreement with specific dispositions of the contemporary Jewish society are mentioned, namely marriage, wealth and the temple, which, however, does not translate

---

<sup>115</sup> Cf. fn 95; 101.

<sup>116</sup> CD 20:7-10 is part of the passage CD 19:33-20:27 which was composed after the death of the Teacher (cf. 20:13-14) and is seen by several scholars as being part of the redactional material; cf. *Hempel* 2000, 44-49. 4QD<sup>a</sup> 11 is attributed by Hempel, *Laws*, 184, 185, to “a late stage in the composition of the laws” and shows “evidence of redactional activity both by the Serekh redactor as well as the Damascus redactor whose work is evident in the close relationship of this text to the Admonition”.

<sup>117</sup> Cf. fn 96; 97; 102. - In the light of Hempel’s assessment of the redactional evidence in 4QD<sup>a</sup> 11 (cf. n. 116) and of the above remarks as to similarities between CD 20:7-10 and the S-tradition it might be asked whether the laws of seclusion in CD 20 are influenced by the S-tradition as well.

<sup>118</sup> This argument holds despite what has been said about chronology in D since the separatist laws in CD 20 and 4QD<sup>a</sup> 11 seem to have been introduced under the influence of the S-tradition; cf. n. 116; 117. For the chronological relationship between D and S cf. Evans Kapfer, “Relationship,” and the scholars discussed by her.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. H. Stegemann, “Das Gesetzkörper der Damaskusschriften,” *RevQ* 14 (1990); P.R. Davies, “The Judaism(s) of the Damascus Document,” in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February, 1998* (ed. J. M. Baumgarten et al.; STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 2000); Regev, “Yaḥad,” 256.

<sup>120</sup> Cf. 109; 111.

into a legally postulated withdrawal from society. Strict separation is only demanded from persons who originally were closely associated with the Community. This, however, is not strongly stressed in the materials which predate the death of the Teacher.

As contrary to D the group behind S shows a community whose view of the outside world, for the most part, is restricted to its immediate fringes, namely to its former associates, the rival group of the “men of injustice”, etc., the apostates, and the expelled. The S-tradition, in other words, only reflects upon those groups of the Jewish society which in one way or the other directly seem to challenge the very existence of the community.

Consequently, the self-centeredness and reclusiveness of Essene Judaism as represented in Qumran literature in no way is characteristic of the whole group as scholars often assume<sup>121</sup>, but of one subgroup, namely the community behind S.

#### **4. Conclusion**

As was noted at the beginning, the intention of this paper is not to claim inclusivist tendencies for Qumran literature at the expense of its well-documented exclusivist features. Its purpose rather is to bring to the fore a dimension usually ignored. The main results of this study may be summarized as follows:

(a) In Qumran literature inclusivist tendencies can be found both in eschatological texts and in materials dealing with the self-understanding of the Qumran Community in historical time. The legal texts discussed basically confirm this pattern. The Community is to separate from members of three Jewish groups with whom it earlier entertained close relations, and is to keep apart from Gentiles. At the same time it is to support the poor and proselytes. Strictly legal statements about contacts with non-Essene Judaism as such are missing.

(b) Parallel argumentative patterns can be discerned in the eschatological and the non-eschatological texts. The first common pattern is the understanding of the Community as existing for the benefit of non-Essene Israel. In some of the eschatological texts discussed (1a), eschatological redemption for all Israel is connected with the Community. Likewise, the covenant established in the Community is understood as covenant for Israel as a whole. Its beneficial role for all Israel is most obvious in those texts which define the Community's role vis-a-vis its environment in terms of “atoning for the land” (2b). There is one text, 1QSa 1:1-6, in which both the dimensions of the Community's existence for the benefit of Israel are connected (1a; 2b). The second common pattern, which can be observed, is the differentiation between the real opponents of the Community and the rest of non-Essene Judaism or, as the case may be, the nations<sup>122</sup>. Only the actual opponents are expressly excluded, whether from eschatological salvation (1a, d), or from contacts with members of the Community (3b). In contrast, Israel at large - or similarly, the non-combatant part of the nations - is either ignored or seen in a neutral, if not positive, manner. These common argumentative patterns underline the fact that inclusivist tendencies in Qumran literature are not just random statements, but basic to Qumran thought.

---

<sup>121</sup> Cf. n. 3; 4.

<sup>122</sup> Cf. above n. 26.

(c) In the texts discussed inclusivist and exclusivist tendencies have different weight. A pan-Israelite perspective could be seen in 4QpNah, 4QFlor (1a), 4QSM (1c) and especially in 4QMMT (1a; 3c), 1QSa (1a; 2b) and CD/4QD (2a; 3a.c). This perspective is missing almost entirely in 1QS. This evidence corresponds to what has already been observed by many scholars: that S as contrary to CD/4QD and 1QSa, but also to 4QMMT<sup>123</sup> presupposes a community without women and children. The latter texts, especially CD/4QD, imply a community made up of families and related to the wider society in many ways whereas the S-tradition draws the picture of a male community whose view of the outside world is confined to its immediate (ideological?) enemies<sup>124</sup>.

It has been the exclusivist portrayal of the community in the S-tradition in connection with a mistaken understanding of the “men of injustice”, etc., which, to a large degree, determined and guided the scholarly perception of what in Qumran literature is community in its social dimensions. This portrayal, however, represents only one understanding of the social world of an Essene community. The D-tradition is the proof of it.

(d) Rather than being a contradiction, exclusivism and inclusivism in Qumran literature are two sides of one and the same coin. The Qumran Community is convinced that it possesses the one correct and final interpretation of the Torah which is for the good of all Israel<sup>125</sup>. This self-understanding necessitates both the opening up for non-members with the purpose of their reverting to the only truly beneficial and salvatory interpretation of the Torah, and the separation from those who transgress it. Therefore, the covenant based upon this interpretation of the Torah likewise is both exclusivist and inclusivist.

---

<sup>123</sup> Cf. n. 107.

<sup>124</sup> Two things, however, have to be noted. (1) 1QS 5-9, this strongly exclusivist text, preserves early inclusivist traditions (2b). (2) The editor or scribe of 1QS directly combined strongly exclusivist texts (1QS 1:1-3:12; 5:1-9:26) with a text showing inclusivist tendencies (1QS 3:13-4:26) and adds 1QSa and 1QSB, texts which also show inclusivist tendencies. To the editor/scribe of the scroll 1QS at least both perspectives could stand side by side and represented a *particula veri* each.

<sup>125</sup> Cf. 4QMMT<sup>c</sup> 14-17 ii 2-3, 7-8 par; 4QD<sup>e</sup> 7 ii 12-15 (see above 2a).