



BRILL

DEAD SEA DISCOVERIES 24 (2017) 59–80

Dead Sea  
Discoveries

brill.com/dsd

# “The Final Priests of Jerusalem” and “The Mouth of the Priest”: Eschatology and Literary History in Peshar Habakkuk\*

*Pieter B. Hartog*

Protestant Theological University (Groningen)

*P.B.Hartog@pthu.nl*

## Abstract

This article argues that 1QpHab 2:5–10 and 1QpHab 9:3–7 are later additions to Peshar Habakkuk. As these are the only passages in Peshar Habakkuk which explicitly refer to “the latter days,” I propose that these additions constitute an explicitly eschatological literary layer, which was presumably added to Peshar Habakkuk in the Herodian era. This literary development of Peshar Habakkuk demonstrates that the Pesharim are not static entities, but partake in a living and fluid interpretative tradition.

## Keywords

Peshar Habakkuk – Eschatology – Textual Fluidity – Literary History

The Qumran scrolls offer invaluable insights into ancient text production. These insights have an important bearing on theories of the literary development of the Hebrew Scriptures. Hence the plea for cross-fertilization between Hebrew Bible and Qumran studies.<sup>1</sup> But cross-fertilization can work both ways.

---

\* I thank Jutta Jokiranta and Eibert Tigchelaar for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this article. I am also grateful to Jutta Jokiranta and Bronson Brown-DeVost for sharing their unpublished work with me.

1 See, e.g., Emanuel Tov, “The Writing of Early Scrolls: Implications for the Literary Analysis of Hebrew Scripture,” in *L'Écrit et l'Esprit: Études d'histoire du texte et de théologie biblique en hommage à Adrian Schenker*, ed. Dieter Böhler, Innocent Himbaza, and Philippe Hugo, OBO 214 (Fribourg: Academic Press, 2005), 355–71; Reinhard G. Kratz, “Innerbiblische Exegese

If the scrolls remind us of the material aspects of the textual development of Scripture, the application of redaction-critical and literary-critical methodology to the scrolls allows us to trace the development of Second Temple Jewish writings even if these writings exist in only one manuscript.

From this perspective this article seeks to reconstruct an episode in the literary development of Peshar Habakkuk. My argument is that the commentary as we now have it in 1QpHab is the result of at least a three-stage development. In an earlier stage of its development, Peshar Habakkuk did not contain 1QpHab 2:5–10 and 1QpHab 9:3–7. These passages, which constitute a distinct literary layer and reflect an intensification of eschatological expectations among the followers of the Teacher of Righteousness, were added to the Peshar presumably in the Herodian era. In the first century CE, Peshar Habakkuk was copied again, resulting in the manuscript we have today.

## 1 Reading Peshar Habakkuk as a Composite Work

Unlike other major compositions such as the Community Rule or the War Scroll, the Pesharim have been preserved in one manuscript each.<sup>2</sup> Detailed arguments for literary development in the Qumran commentaries are therefore hard to come by. The first substantial challenge to the unity of Peshar Habakkuk came from Hanan Eshel. Eshel argued that this Peshar incorporates two historical layers, one from the second century BCE (the lifetime of the Teacher of Righteousness), the other from the first century BCE (the Roman invasion of Palestine).<sup>3</sup> This is an intriguing suggestion, but I doubt if it can be accepted in the form Eshel proposed. Eshel is not clear, for instance, on

---

und Redaktionsgeschichte im Lichte empirischer Evidenz," in *Das Judentum im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels*, FAT 42 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 126–56; idem, "Das Alte Testament und die Texte vom Toten Meer," *ZAW* 125 (2013): 198–213; Andrew Teeter, "The Hebrew Bible and/as Second Temple Literature: Methodological Reflections," *DSD* 20 (2013): 349–77.

2 This is the most economic explanation of the material, to which most scholars adhere. A well-known exception is Hartmut Stegemann, who argued that the Qumran Peshar manuscripts constitute one Psalms commentary, one Hosea commentary, and two Isaiah commentaries. See *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 125–30. Roman Vielhauer has disproved Stegemann's suggestion on the Hosea Pesharim in his "Materielle Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der beiden Pescharim zum Hoseabuch (*4QpHos<sup>a</sup>* und *4QpHos<sup>b</sup>*)," *RevQ* 20/77 (2001): 39–91.

3 Hanan Eshel, "The Two Historical Layers of Peshar Habakkuk," in *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006*, ed. Anders K. Petersen et al., STDJ 80 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 107–17.

how we must understand the two sources that underlie Peshar Habakkuk. Did these sources constitute running commentaries on the book of Habakkuk, just like the final Peshar? Or were they collections of more disparate expositions of scriptural passages? The latter option leads more naturally to Eshel's view that Peshar Habakkuk includes a range of divergent materials. But Eshel seems to opt for the former idea, assuming that some interpretations from the second century source were replaced by others in the first century and went into oblivion. At the same time, the first-century source was only fragmentarily incorporated into Peshar Habakkuk and several second-century expositions remained in the text.<sup>4</sup> This scenario is problematic, however, because it posits the existence of early interpretations of Hab 1–2, whose existence it is impossible to confirm (Eshel assumes that they were replaced by later interpretations). Why, then, should we assume that such early interpretations were present at all? This issue is connected with Eshel's tendency to read the evidence in a historicizing manner. For Eshel, comments on the Teacher of Righteousness must stem from the lifetime of the Teacher or shortly thereafter,<sup>5</sup> while those on the Kittim must stem from the period of the Roman invasion in Palestine. These assumptions fail to reckon with recent developments in the study of historical references in the Pesharim.<sup>6</sup> In these developments the concept of historical memory has come to occupy a prominent place. As a result, scholars have become increasingly aware that comments on the Teacher or the Romans may stem from a later era than the historical events they commemorate, and that these references may have been subject to alteration and embellishment.<sup>7</sup>

4 Eshel, "Two Historical Layers," 115: "It can therefore be supposed that the first peshar, *an interpretation of Hab 1–2*, was written not long after the time in which the Teacher of Righteousness, the Man of the Lie, and the Wicked Priest lived, placing it in the second half of the second century BCE. It seems that most of the other pesharim recorded in 1QpHab were also composed during this time. Subsequent to the Roman takeover of Judaea, however, it was decided to update the manuscript. *New pesharim on Hab 1:6–11.14–17 were added, replacing older pesharim on these verses*" (my italics).

5 For Eshel this means the second century BCE. Others have expressed different views, but I leave aside this issue for now, as this is not of particular importance for my argument. For a survey of the debate see Michael O. Wise, "The Origins and History of the Teacher's Movement," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 92–122.

6 See generally Philip R. Davies, "What History Can We Get from the Scrolls, and How?" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*, ed. Charlotte Hempel, STDJ 90 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 31–46.

7 On historical memory in Hebrew Bible studies see the essays in Stephen C. Barton, Loren T. Stuckenbruck, and Benjamin G. Wold, eds., *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity: The Fifth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium (Durham, September 2004)*, WUNT 112 (Tübingen:

Moreover, references to the Teacher of Righteousness or the Kittim have been noted to play a role in processes of identity construction on the part of the Peshar commentators and the movement to which they belong.<sup>8</sup> The primary purpose of these references, therefore, is not to convey reliable historical information in our sense of the term.

But even if Eshel's theory cannot entirely convince, it remains important for reminding us of the possibility of reworking in the Pesharim. Shani Tzoref walks in Eshel's footsteps when she suggests that 4Q169 3–4 i 6–8 are an addition to Peshar Nahum. Tzoref bases this suggestion on her observation that the Pesharim tend to “gloss the epithet Seekers-after-Smooth-Things with the words אַחֲרֵי־הַיָּמִים. The occurrence of ‘Seekers-after-Smooth-Things’ without this gloss in 4QpNah 3–4, I is exceptional.”<sup>9</sup> Tzoref surmises that Alexander Jannaeus' suppression of the Pharisees “had been presented in an early version of 4QpNah as ‘the’ eschatological fulfillment of Nahum. . . . Subsequently, with the Pharisaic revival and dominance under Salome, the peshar would have required editing.”<sup>10</sup> This editing would have included the deletion of the reference to the latter days. Tzoref's reading of Peshar Nahum is more plausible than Eshel's of Peshar Habakkuk, as Tzoref does not reckon with the wholesale replacement of earlier interpretations, but with processes of reworking and adaptation. At the same time, there is little evidence to support her assumption that Peshar Nahum portrayed Jannaeus' suppression of the Pharisees as the ultimate fulfillment of Nahum, and her suggestion of reworking in this Peshar must for now remain speculative.

Stephen Llewelyn, Stephanie Ng, Gareth Wearne, and Alexandra Wrathall develop a different approach to the issue of literary development in the Pesharim. Their argument for literary growth in Peshar Habakkuk is not based not on the alleged historical background of this commentary, but on the scribal features of 1QpHab.<sup>11</sup> In Llewelyn, Ng, Wearne, and Wrathall's view,

---

Mohr Siebeck, 2007); Ehud Ben Zvi and Christoph Levin, eds., *Remembering and Forgetting in Early Second Temple Judah*, FAT 85 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012).

8 See Jutta Jokiranta, “The Prototypical Teacher in the Qumran Pesharim: A Social Identity Approach,” in *Ancient Israel: The Old Testament in Its Social Context*, ed. Philip F. Esler (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2006), 254–63; eadem, *Social Identity and Sectarianism in the Qumran Movement*, STDJ 105 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 175–82.

9 Shani L. Berrin (Tzoref), *The Peshar Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169*, STDJ 53 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 214.

10 Berrin (Tzoref), *The Peshar Nahum Scroll*, 215.

11 “A Case of Two *Vorlagen* Behind the Habakkuk Commentary (1QpHab),” in *Keter Shem Tov: Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Alan Crown*, ed. Shani L. Tzoref and Ian Young, PHSC 20 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2013), 123–50.

these features indicate that 1QpHab had two *Vorlagen*. Some *vacats* in 1QpHab may mark the breaks between these *Vorlagen*. What is more, Llewelyn and his colleagues argue that the X-shaped signs in 1QpHab indicate the beginnings and ends of columns in the two *Vorlagen* of 1QpHab.<sup>12</sup> Their argument addresses important issues, but some problems remain. Despite their claim to the contrary, this explanation of the X-shaped signs in 1QpHab is unlikely in view of the use of the same signs in 11Q20, which was copied by the same scribe as 1QpHab.<sup>13</sup> The *vacats* in 1QpHab, too, are more likely to point to literary development in the Peshet than to different *Vorlagen*.<sup>14</sup> Another problem with the suggestions of Llewelyn and his colleagues is their exclusive focus on written *Vorlagen* to 1QpHab. This focus does not do justice to the complexities of literary development: if Peshet Habakkuk exhibits literary growth, this does not imply that additions to the Peshet must derive from *written* sources. They may have originated orally, or they may have been the invention of a scribe who incorporated his findings directly into the manuscript he was producing.

This is to say that the Pesharim are part of a living and fluid, rather than a closed and stable, tradition. The “voice of the Teacher,” which the Pesharim claim to represent,<sup>15</sup> did not come to a halt when the Pesharim were written

12 This goes back to an earlier suggestion by Hartmut Stegemann, to which Eshel, “Two Historical Layers,” 108–9 refers. Stegemann did not reckon with two *Vorlagen*. For Eshel, these signs “mark the vertical edges of the columns of the text” in the *Vorlage* of 1QpHab and were copied somewhat sloppily in 1QpHab.

13 On 1QpHab and 11Q20 being copied by the same scribe see Johannes P.M van der Ploeg, “Les manuscrits de la grotte XI de Qumrân,” *RevQ* 12/45 (1985): 3–15 (9). Llewelyn, Ng, Wearne, and Wrathall’s idea that the *Vorlage* of 11Q20 “and its copy consisted of the same number of lines in their columns” (“A Case of Two *Vorlagen*,” 134) is ad hoc. More importantly, they overlook the fact that, in contrast to 1QpHab, X-shaped signs occur only twice in 11Q20. If the absence of these signs is not due to chance, this speaks against their purpose as markers of column ends in a *Vorlage*. Cf. Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, *DJD* 23:364, who writes that “the only common feature [between the X-shaped signs in 11Q20 and 1QpHab, PBH] seems to be that, in all the cases, the line ends some distance before the margin.”

14 As was suggested by H. Gregory Snyder, “Naughts and Crosses: Peshet Manuscripts and their Significance for Reading Practices at Qumran,” *DSD* 7 (2000): 26–48; George J. Brooke, “Physicality, Paratextuality, and Peshet Habakkuk,” in *On the Fringe of Commentary: Metatextuality in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Cultures*, ed. Sydney H. Aufrère, Philip S. Alexander, and Zlatko Pleše, *OLA* 232 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 175–93 (185–87).

15 See Florentino García Martínez, “Beyond the Sectarian Divide: The ‘Voice of the Teacher’ as an Authority-Conferring Strategy in Some Qumran Texts,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*, ed. Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen Schuller, *STDJ* 92 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 227–44.

down.<sup>16</sup> On the contrary, the written versions of these commentaries were prone to be further adapted, reworked, and added to by later exegetes continuing and expanding the Teacher's voice. Jutta Jokiranta has recently emphasized this point.<sup>17</sup> She points out that 1QpHab 6:12–7:8 depict the Teacher of Righteousness as the reader of what Habakkuk has written down. The Teacher's readings invited readings of the prophets by later commentators, who wrote them down in what have become the Pesharim. So, Jokiranta concludes, "authority did not lie in the final interpretation that the *peshet* sections are sometimes thought to contain. Rather, authority lay in the interpretative activity of the faithful ones."<sup>18</sup> She further argues that the passage on the Teacher as the reader of prophetic Scripture (1QpHab 7:3–7), which is preceded by an unexpected *vacat*, may be a later addition to an existing Peshet and so itself be a result of the living interpretative tradition in which the Pesharim partake.<sup>19</sup>

My argument in this paper thus assumes the participation of the Pesharim in a living tradition of scholarship and exegesis.<sup>20</sup> I shall focus on one outcome of this living tradition: the addition of an explicitly eschatological layer, consisting of 1QpHab 2:5–10 and 1QpHab 9:3–7, to an existing Peshet. This literary layer displays a particular concern with priests and seems to evoke the demise of the Hasmonaean priesthood to construct the expectation of an eschatological priest in the latter days.

16 This ambiguous attitude is reflected in the work of Frank M. Cross. On the one hand, Cross attributes the contents of the Pesharim to a living and fluid tradition: ultimately going back to the Teacher, they were "transmitted and supplemented . . . in the regular study of scholars of the community" (*The Ancient Library of Qumran*, rev. ed. [Garden City, NY: Anchor, 1961], 113 [my italics]). On the other hand, Cross considered the extant Peshet manuscripts to be autographs; hence, for him, the fluid transmission of exegetical material came to a halt once the Pesharim were committed to writing.

17 "Quoting, Writing, and Reading: Authority in *Peshet Habakkuk* from Qumran," in *Between Canonical and Apocryphal Texts: Processes of Reception, Rewriting and Interpretation in Early Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Jörg Frey, Claire Clivaz, and Tobias Nicklas, WUNT (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, forthcoming).

18 Jokiranta, "Quoting, Writing, and Reading."

19 Alternatively, 1QpHab 7:1–2 could be an addition. See Jokiranta, "Quoting, Writing, and Reading."

20 Cf. Pieter B. Hartog, "Peshet as Commentary," in *Proceedings of the Eighth Meeting of the International Organization of Qumran Studies: Munich, 4–7 August, 2013*, ed. George J. Brooke et al., STDJ (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming); idem, "Interlinear Additions and Literary Development in 4Q163/*Peshet Isaiah C*, 4Q169/*Peshet Nahum*, and 4Q171/*Peshet Psalms A*," *RevQ* (forthcoming).

2 1QpHab 2:5–10

The first passage under consideration is part of a longer lemma-interpretation unit, which for the sake of my discussion I quote in full:

1QpHab 1:16–2:10<sup>21</sup>

1:16 [ראו בוגדים והביטו 17 והתמהו תמהו כי פעל פועל בימיכם לוא תאמינו כי] 2:1 יסופר *vacat* [פשר הדבר על] הבוגדים עם איש 2 הכזב כי לוא [האמינו בדברי] מורה הצדקה מפיא 3 אל ועל הבוג[דים בברית] החדשה כ[י]א לוא 4 האמינו בברית אל [וכיא חל]ל[ו] את שם קודשו 5 וכן *vacat* פשר הדבר [על הבו]גדים לאחרית 6 הימים המה עריצ[י הבר]ית אשר לוא יאמינוא 7 בשומעם את כול הבא[ות ע]ל הדור האחרון מפי 8 הכוהן אשר נתן אל ב[לבו בינ]ה לפשור את כול 9 דברי עבדיו הנביאים [כיא] בידם ספר אל את 10 כול הבאות על עמו וע[ל עירו]

1:16 [“Look, traitors, behold, and 17 be utterly astonished! For I am performing a deed in your days which you shall not believe, when] 2:1 it is told” (Hab 1:5) <*vacat*> [The interpretation of the matter concerns] the traitors with the Man of 2 the Lie, for they [have not believed the words] of the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of 3 God. (It) also concerns the trai[tors within the] new [covenant,] be[cau]se they have not 4 believed God’s covenant [and because they have pro]fan[ed] his holy name. 5 And likewise, <*vacat*> the interpretation of the matter [concerns the trai]tors in the latter 6 days. They are the ruthle[ss ones of the cove]nant, who do not believe 7 when they hear everything that is to co[me up] on the last generation from the mouth of 8 the priest, in [whose heart] God has given [insig]ht to interpret all 9 the words of his servants, the prophets, [for] through them God has told 10 everything that is to come upon his people and up[on his city].

These lines have become a *locus classicus* for literary growth in the Pesharim, with various scholars suggesting that they constitute an addition to an existing Pesher.<sup>22</sup> Three main arguments support this view. Firstly, the repetition of

21 Quotations follow Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings*, 2 vols. (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2010, 2013). Translations are my own.

22 See Florentino García Martínez, “El pesher: Interpretación profética de la Escritura,” *Salmanticensis* 26 (1979): 125–39 (137; see also n. 45); Snyder, “Naughts and Crosses,” 39–40; Jokiranta, *Social Identity and Sectarianism*, 154; Brooke, “Physicality, Paratextuality, and Peshar Habakkuk,” 186.

the formula “the interpretation of the matter concerns” in line 5 is unexpected in the light of the connection between the two other interpretations in line 3. This other connection does not repeat the interpretation formula, but simply introduces the second interpretation with “(it) also concerns.” The emphatic “and likewise” and the problematic *vacat* in line 5 add to the oddity of this line. Secondly, the verb יִאֲמֹנֹה in line 6 does not sit well with its co-text. It is an imperfect, whereas the two preceding interpretations (if the reconstruction in line 2 is accepted) use a perfect. Moreover, the 3rd person plural ending in *ʾaleph* is irregular not just in Peshar Habakkuk (cf. יִאֲמִינוּ in line 14), but in the scrolls as a whole.<sup>23</sup> Thirdly, the *ʾaleph* placed at the utmost left of the column of writing in line 5 might also point to the secondary nature of these lines.<sup>24</sup>

### 2.1 *Literary and Hermeneutical Development*

The three groups of traitors referred to in 1QpHab 1:16–2:10 have been taken to constitute a case of “multiple interpretations” in the Pesharim. According to this theory, בֹּגְדִים (“traitors”) in the lemma (if indeed it was there)<sup>25</sup> was interpreted in three different ways by the Peshar commentator.<sup>26</sup>

- 
- 23 Because of its problematic morphology some scholars prefer to read it as יִאֲמִינוּ and interpret the *ʾaleph* as a scribal sign, along the lines of the *ʾaleph* in line 5. See Eshel, “Two Historical Layers,” 109 (n. 10). I consider this explanation unnecessary in view of the material features of the manuscript (which can be consulted at <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/habakkuk> [last accessed 8 September, 2016]). There is no need to separate the *ʾaleph* from the rest of the verb, and there seems to be no good reason for the scribe to write an *ʾaleph* here.
- 24 Snyder, “Naughts and Crosses,” 40 writes that “the ⚡ that appears at the end of line 5... marks the occurrence of the double pesher,” but his only argument is that “both the marginal letter and the multiple interpretation are singular occurrences within the Habakkuk pesher.” A more intriguing, but as of yet unsubstantiated, suggestion comes from Bronson Brown-DeVost. On the basis of the use of *šanu* (“another [interpretation]”) and *šanš* (“secondly”) in Mesopotamian commentaries Brown-DeVost argues that this *ʾaleph* may stand for אָהַר (“another [interpretation]”). See his “Commentary and Authority in Mesopotamia and Qumran” (PhD diss., Brandeis University, 2015), 181–86 (esp. 184–85).
- 25 Most scholars assume that it was. The reading בֹּגְדִים seems to be supported by LXX’s καταφρονῆται. For a discussion see William H. Brownlee, *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran*, SBLMS 11 (Philadelphia, PA: Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1959), *ad loc.*
- 26 A recent supporter of this theory is Matthias Weigold, “Ancient Jewish Commentaries in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Multiple Interpretations as a Distinctive Feature?” in *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Nóra Dávid et al., FRLANT 239 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 281–94. Weigold’s discussion of this passage is related

This explanation of the hermeneutics of this passage (or its link between the lemma and its interpretation) is problematic, however. To begin with, the idea that the commentator interpreted one element from the lemma in multiple ways does not account for the number of traitors mentioned in the passage (why three rather than two or four?). Moreover, the notion of multiple interpretations may imply that the three references to traitors in the interpretation are only loosely related both to each other and to the lemma. The reverse is the case: these groups of traitors are closely connected on a literary level, and the interpretation as a whole mimics the structure of the lemma (Hab 1:5).<sup>27</sup> Therefore, it is more fruitful to assume that the commentator took up two (three after the addition of 1QpHab 2:5–10)<sup>28</sup> elements from his base text and interpreted them in turn.

Before the addition of 1QpHab 2:5–10, this interpretation of Hab 1:5 seems to have depended on the clauses “look . . . and behold” (ראו . . . והביטו) and “and be utterly astonished” (והתמהו תמהו) in the lemma. In Hab 1:5, these clauses

---

to his larger argument about the presence or absence of multiple interpretations in the Pesharim. In Weigold’s view, this passage in Peshar Habakkuk is the only example of multiple interpretations in the Pesharim.

My rejection of these lines in Peshar Habakkuk as a case of multiple interpretations does not mean that I deny the presence of such interpretations in the Pesharim altogether. Elsewhere in Peshar Habakkuk, the word הרעל in the lemma informs the reference to “the foreskin of his heart” (עורלת לבו) as well as the idea of confusion or drunkenness in the interpretation (1QpHab 11:9–16 *ap.* Hab 2:16). In Peshar Nahum, the phrase ואין מחריד in Nah 2:12 is read in two different ways by the commentator (see 4Q169 3–4 i 1–4 and Berrin [Tzoref], *The Peshar Nahum Scroll*, 138–40).

27 Steven Fraade stresses this important point when he writes: “By this structure the commentary does not simply convey the base-text’s meaning to its students but conveys those very students, as it were, through the history of the sect from its beginning through its more recent past to its imminent ending, *even while unifying that history in relation to the prophetic base-verse*” (*From Tradition to Commentary: Torah and Its Interpretation in the Midrash Sifre to Deuteronomy*, SUNY Series in Judaica [New York: State University of New York University Press, 1991], 6 [his italics]).

28 There has been a lot of debate on the question how many groups of traitors are represented in 1QpHab 1:16–2:10 and how they are temporally related. In these debates, historical and literary analysis often impinge on each other. If we restrict ourselves to the literary side of things, I think there can be little doubt that this passage originally (before the addition of 1QpHab 2:5–10) described two groups of traitors within a single timeframe. With the addition of 1QpHab 2:5–10, the passage came to speak of three groups of traitors in two different time frames. For a good overview of the debate and a conclusion similar to mine see Phillip R. Callaway, *The History of the Qumran Community: An Investigation*, JSPSup 3 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), 142–46.

describe actions of the traitors; in the interpretation, these two similar syntactical structures inform the reference to two groups of traitors. With the addition of 1QpHab 2:5–10, the relation between the lemma and its interpretation changed. The basis for the interpretation was now no longer the two parallel *clauses*, but the three different *roots* in Hab 1:5. These roots (תמ"ה, נב"ט, רא"ה) describe actions of the traitors as well, and their use in the lemma governs the mention of three groups of traitors in the interpretation. Thus, the addition of 1QpHab 2:5–10 to Peshier Habakkuk triggered a redefinition of the link between this interpretation of Hab 1:5 and its lemma.

## 2.2 1QpHab 2:5–10 and Other Passages in the Scrolls

In his creation of 1QpHab 2:5–10, the composer of this passage took up language from other passages in the scrolls—especially from Peshier Psalms A and column 7 of Peshier Habakkuk.<sup>29</sup> Most important for my purpose is the occurrence of a “Priest” in both Peshier Psalms A and Peshier Habakkuk. In 4Q171 1–2 ii 16–20, the Priest is depicted as being threatened by “the wicked ones of Ephraim and Manasseh, who attempt to lay hands on the Priest and the men of his council.” In 4Q171 3–5 iii 14–17, he is equated with the Teacher of Righteousness (if the reconstruction in line 15 is correct) and presented as the founder of a community. As we shall see, such a direct relationship between the Teacher and the Priest must not be assumed in 1QpHab 2:5–10. Nonetheless, these intertextual connections between Peshier Psalms A and Peshier Habakkuk demonstrate that the Priest in 1QpHab 2:5–10 is portrayed in terms that are elsewhere used to depict the Teacher.<sup>30</sup>

The similarity between the Teacher and the Priest is also evident from the use of terminology from 1QpHab 7:1–5 in 1QpHab 2:5–10. The first passage belongs to an earlier stratum of Peshier Habakkuk and characterizes the Teacher of Righteousness as having received insight into “all the mysteries of the words of

29 See, e.g., George J. Brooke, “The Pesharim and the Origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects*, ed. Michael O. Wise et al., ANSYS 722 (New York: The New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 339–53; Jokiranta, *Social Identity and Sectarianism*.

30 The chronological relationship between Peshier Psalms A and Peshier Habakkuk is difficult to determine. 4Q171 probably dates from the Herodian era and may be contemporaneous with 1QpHab 2:5–10. On the date of 4Q171 see Frank M. Cross, “The Development of the Jewish Scripts,” in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*, ed. George E. Wright (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1961), 133–202 (174 and n. 134).

his servants, the prophets.”<sup>31</sup> Similar terminology recurs in 1QpHab 2:5–10. The Priest is said to interpret (פִּשְׂר) “all the words of his servants, the prophets.” The prophets, in turn, are the ones “through whom God has told what was to befall his people Israel.” Compare 1QpHab 7:1: “God told Habakkuk to write down what would befall the last generation.” The Teacher and the Priest, therefore, engage in similar activities, and their interpretations have a similar object. Clearly the image of the Priest in 1QpHab 2:5–10 is modelled on the image of the Teacher in Peshier Psalms A and earlier strata of Peshier Habakkuk.<sup>32</sup>

This also means that, contrary to the near universal consensus, the Priest in 1QpHab 2:5–10 must not be equated with the Teacher of Righteousness. Like the Teacher, the Priest is a teacher and interpreter of prophetic Scripture, and he, too, will meet with individuals failing to heed his words. But he is not identical with the Teacher. According to 1QpHab 2:5–10, the Priest continues the Teacher’s office in a period later than the Teacher’s (who is referred to in 1QpHab 2:1–3<sup>33</sup>).<sup>34</sup> From this perspective the image of the Priest acquires a further dimension: the Priest as he appears in 1QpHab 2:5–10 embodies the exegetical activity of the Peshier commentators. If the Teacher in 1QpHab 6:12–7:8 is implied to partake in the revelation once bestowed upon the prophet Habakkuk, so the Priest in 1QpHab 2:5–10 receives the same revelation, continuing the words of Habakkuk and the exegetical activity (the “reading”) of the Teacher.<sup>35</sup> This portrayal of the Priest supports the activity of the Peshier

31 Cf. Jokiranta’s suggestion that 1QpHab 7:3–5 (the passage on the Teacher) may be an addition to column 7 (“Quoting, Writing, and Reading”).

32 This is not to say, of course, that the Teacher and the Priest are exact copies. As we shall see below, the Priest works in a later period than the Teacher and the way in which Peshier Habakkuk portrays his activities bears the stamp of the increased eschatological awareness that characterises 1QpHab 2:5–10. At the same time, by portraying the Priest in terms reminiscent of the Teacher the person(s) responsible for adding 1QpHab 2:5–10 to Peshier Habakkuk appropriate(s) the authority attached to the Teacher for themselves.

33 The Teacher is here referred to as מוֹרֵה הַצְּדִיקָה (with the article added above the line). I see little reason to attribute any particular significance to this phraseology in comparison with the more common expression מוֹרֵה הַצְּדִיק.

34 This is how the Priest is portrayed in literary terms: the passage on the Priest employs the imperfect, whereas that on the Teacher employs the perfect tense. I do not think it is helpful to try to connect the Priest (or the Teacher, for that matter) with a particular historical individual. It seems to me that the main significance of the figure of the Priest lies in how he embodies the collective activity of the Peshier exegete.

35 On the prophet and the Teacher partaking in the same divine revelation (the difference between their interpretations being the result of their different positions in history) see Devorah Dimant, “Exegesis and Time in the Pesharim from Qumran,” *RÉJ* 168 (2009): 373–93; eadem, “Time, Torah and Prophecy at Qumran,” in *History, Ideology and Bible*

commentators, who consider themselves heirs to the revelation and interpretations of the Teacher.<sup>36</sup> The image of the Priest, therefore, validates the work of the composer of 1QpHab 2:5–10.<sup>37</sup> Adding his exposition to an earlier Peshar, the composer of 1QpHab 2:5–10 did not intend to denigrate or surpass the work of the Teacher, but to continue it: the revelation imparted on the Teacher engendered a living interpretative tradition in which the composer of 1QpHab 2:5–10 positions himself and which will culminate in the arrival of the Priest in the latter days.

### 2.3 *Teacher and Priest*

The similarities between the Teacher and the Priest in Peshar Habakkuk—with the latter explicitly situated in the latter days—must be understood in light of the eschatological potential of the mention of “one who shall teach righteousness in the latter days” (וִּירָה צְדָק בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים) in the Damascus Document (CD 6:11). This reference triggered a debate between Philip Davies, Michael Knibb, and John Collins. For Davies, the reference in CD 6 belongs to an early strata of the Damascus Document tradition, which provided the basis for later references to the Teacher of Righteousness in the Damascus Document and the Pesharim. These later references would be the work of followers of the historical<sup>38</sup> Teacher, who portrayed their master as the fulfilment of this

---

*Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies*, FAT 90 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 301–14 (esp. 303–8).

36 See Hartog, “Peshar as Commentary.”

37 Cf. García Martínez, “Beyond the Sectarian Divide,” 241.

38 The term “historical” should not be taken to imply that the Damascus Document, the Pesharim, or any other of the Qumran writings supply objective historical information about the Teacher of Righteousness. Instead, the Teacher, like all other figures mentioned in the Pesharim, is a historical *construct*. Specifically on the Teacher see Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “The Teacher of Righteousness Remembered: From Fragmentary Sources to Collective Memory in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity*, 75–94; idem, “The Legacy of the Teacher of Righteousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *New Perspectives on Old Texts: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 9–11 January, 2005*, ed. Esther G. Chazon, Betsy Halpern-Amaru, and Ruth A. Clements, STDJ 88 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 23–49. Cf. also Reinhard G. Kratz, “Der Pescher Nahum und seine biblische Vorlage,” in *Prophetenstudien: Kleine Schriften II*, FAT 74 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 99–145 (105–6).

My use of the term “historical” is rather meant to indicate “past-ness”: the “historical Teacher” is the Teacher who, from the perspective of the author(s) of the scrolls, belongs to the past.

early messianic expectation.<sup>39</sup> In contrast, Knibb observes that the Teacher is nowhere portrayed in quasi-messianic terms and argues that the historical Teacher must be equated with “the Interpreter of the Law” in CD 6:8, and that the “one who shall teach righteousness in the latter days” is an eschatological figure still to be expected.<sup>40</sup> Collins agrees with Knibb and urges his readers not “to multiply teachers without cause.”<sup>41</sup>

It seems to me, however, that the differences between the positions of Davies, on the one hand, and Knibb and Collins, on the other, are not as sharp as they might appear. I agree with Davies that the Interpreter of the Law in CD 6 cannot be equated with the historical Teacher.<sup>42</sup> This equation tends to be based on a historical framework derived from CD 1 and imported into CD 6.<sup>43</sup> From a literary perspective, there is little reason to identify the Teacher with the Interpreter of the Law.<sup>44</sup> The main similarity between the terms is that they can both refer to individuals from the past as well as to eschatological figures still to be expected. But this does not make them identical: rather, they both reflect restorative eschatological expectations of teachers and interpreters who will be present in the latter days as they had been before.<sup>45</sup> If the Interpreter

39 Philip R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the “Damascus Document”*, JSOTSup 25 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), 119–25, 174–75; idem, “The Teacher of Righteousness and the ‘End of Days,’” *RevQ* 13/49–52 (1988): 313–17.

40 “The Teacher of Righteousness—A Messianic Title?” in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History*, ed. Philip R. Davies and Richard T. White, JSOTSup 100 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 51–65 (56–60).

41 *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*, ABRL (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 104.

42 So also Matthew A. Collins, *The Use of Sobriquets in the Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls*, LSTS 67 (London: T&T Clark, 2009), 38–51, who in his discussion of this passage remains close to Davies.

43 So also Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 123.

44 One issue that has received surprisingly little attention in previous scholarship is why the Damascus Document, if it looks back on the activity of the Teacher in CD 6, would refer to him as “the Interpreter of the Law,” whereas elsewhere in the *Damascus Document* the Teacher is called “a Teacher of Righteousness” or “the Unique Teacher.” For a (rare) attempt to explain this anomaly see Michael A. Knibb, “Interpreter of the Law,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 383–84, who suggests that “the use of the title Interpreter of the Law for the Teacher derives naturally from the context of CD v.20–vi.11, in which the emphasis is on the role of the Teacher as the one whose legal decisions alone are authoritative” (383).

45 On the restorative aspect of Qumran eschatology see Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 111–12.

of the Law in CD 6:8 does not refer to the historical Teacher, it remains a distinct possibility that the expression “one who shall teach righteousness in the latter days” belongs to an early stratum of the Damascus Document, which influenced how the Teacher was portrayed by his followers.<sup>46</sup> At the same time, Knibb and Collins are correct to note that the historical Teacher is nowhere depicted in messianic terms. I suggest that the reason for this is the multivalence of the expression “one who shall teach righteousness in the latter days.”<sup>47</sup> Traditions associated with this reference to “one who shall teach righteousness” seem to resurface time and again in the scrolls. Thus, the idea of one teaching righteousness in the latter days was open to multiple applications. This means that followers of the Teacher may have given him the title “Teacher of Righteousness” to evoke this older tradition, but without claiming in absolute terms that he was the (or even a) Messiah. They may well have expected yet another teacher of righteousness who was still to come.<sup>48</sup> The Teacher was not a Messiah, therefore, but he may still have been identified with one teaching righteousness in the end of days. When the composer of 1QpHab 2:5–10 depicts the Priest in terms reminiscent of the Teacher of Righteousness, he builds on the eschatological potential of this image. Like the historical Teacher whom he resembles, the Priest in 1QpHab 2:5–10 can be considered “one who shall teach righteousness in the end of days.”<sup>49</sup>

46 Another possibility is to assume that neither the Interpreter of the Law nor the “one who shall teach righteousness in the latter days” refer to the Teacher. This has been argued by Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*, SDBSRL (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 99 (n. 78), 103; Stuckenbruck, “The Legacy of the Teacher of Righteousness,” 35.

47 I take the idea of multivalence from Berrin (Tzoref), *The Peshet Nahum Scroll*, 12–18. For Tzoref, the term indicates that prophetic utterances are meaningful in themselves and, because of that, are open to multiple fulfilment.

48 This also explains why the reference to “one who shall teach righteousness in the latter days” remained part of the Damascus Document after the activity of the historical Teacher.

49 Joseph Angel agrees with Collins and Knibb that the Interpreter of the Law in CD 6 must be equated with the historical Teacher. He adds, however, that the “one who shall teach righteousness in the end of days” is “the typological, eschatological counterpart of the historical Teacher” (*Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 86 [Leiden: Brill, 2010], 193). I would argue that the historical Teacher is a manifestation of the expectation of “one who shall teach righteousness in the end of days.” The Priest in 1QpHab 2:5–10 is both “the typological, eschatological counterpart of the historical Teacher” (so Angel) and yet another manifestation of the “one who shall teach righteousness in the end of days.”

3 1QpHab 9:3–7

While the possibility that 1QpHab 2:5–10 is a later addition to Peshar Habakkuk has been raised by earlier scholars, few have argued the same thing for 1QpHab 9:3–7.<sup>50</sup> The indications of the secondary nature of this passage may be more subtle than those of 1QpHab 2:5–10, but they are, in my opinion, cumulatively convincing. As above, I quote the larger passage to which these lines belong:

1QpHab 8:13–9:7

8:13 הלוּא פת[ ]אום ויקומו 14 נ[וש]כיך ויקיצו מזעזעיכה והיתה למושוסות למו  
 15 כי אתה שלותה גוים רבים וישלוכה כול יתר עמים 16 *vacat* פ[שר הדבר] על  
 הכוהן אשר מרד 17 [וע]ב[ו]ר חוקי [אל על כן קמו ויתע]ללו בו ל[עשות] 9:1 נגועו  
 במשפטי רשעה ושרוריות מחלים 2 רעים עשו בו ונקמות בגוית בשרו ואשר 3 אמר  
 כי אתה שלותה גוים רבים וישלוכה כול 4 יתר עמים *vacat* פשרו על כוהני ירושלם  
 5 האחורנים אשר יקבוצו הון ובצע משלל העמים 6 ולאחרית הימים יתן הונם עם  
 שללם ביד 7 חיל הכתאיאם *vacat* כיא המה יתר העמים

8:13 “Shall not suddenly 14 your cr[ed]itors arise and those who oppress you, wake up? And you shall be for them to plunder. 15 For you have plundered many peoples, and all remaining nations shall plunder you” (Hab 2:7–8a). 16 *vacat* [The] int[er]pretation of the matter] concerns the priest who had rebelled 17 [and trans]gre[ss]ed the statutes [of God]. Therefore, they arose and they] dealt with him by [inflicting] on him 9:1 an injury, as punishments for wickedness. And horrors of 2 evil diseases they inflicted on him, and acts of vengeance on his body of flesh. And for what 3 he says: “for you have plundered many peoples, and all 4 remaining nations shall plunder you” (Hab 2:8a), *vacat* its interpretation concerns the last priests of Jerusalem, 5 who shall gather wealth and spoil from plundering the nations. 6 But in the latter days their wealth and their spoil shall be given into the hands of the 7 army of the Kittim, *vacat* for they are the remaining nations.

The lines in question do not sit well with their co-text. The preceding and following interpretation sections are concerned with a “priest” in the singular; only this passage deals with “priests” in the plural. 1QpHab 9:3–7 even contains the only reference in the entire Qumran scrolls collection to “the last priests of Jerusalem.” Moreover, 1QpHab 9:3–7 employs the imperfect tense, whereas the

50 The one exception I have been able to find is Jokiranta, *Social Identity and Sectarianism*, 165.

preceding and the following interpretation sections use the perfect.<sup>51</sup> Finally, the reference to “the army of the Kittim” is unexpected. Not only has Brooke noted that the author of Peshar Habakkuk “confines his references to the Kittim to the dialogues of Habakkuk 1,”<sup>52</sup> but the expression “the army of the Kittim” occurs only here in the scrolls. Even though none of these observations may in itself be conclusive evidence for 1QpHab 9:3–7 being a later addition, they do seem to point in this direction when taken together.<sup>53</sup>

### 3.1 1QpHab 9:3–7 and Other Passages in the Scrolls

The expression “the last priests of Jerusalem” in 1QpHab 9:3–7 is a conflation of two other expressions. Peshar Hosea B (4Q167 2 3) refers to “the last priest,” who strikes “Ephraim.” Moreover, Apocryphon of Jeremiah C (4Q387 2 iii 6) mentions the “priests of Jerusalem,” who turned away to serve other gods.<sup>54</sup>

- 
- 51 Discussions of verbal tenses in Peshar Habakkuk have often served to back up specific historical interpretations of this commentary. In reaction to these earlier studies Loren Stuckenbruck emphasizes the literary character of the interchange between perfect and imperfect in Peshar Habakkuk. See his “Temporal Shifts from Text to Interpretation: Concerning the Use of the Perfect and the Imperfect in the *Habakkuk Peshar* (1QpHab),” in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions*, ed. Michael T. Davis and Brent A. Strawn (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007), 124–49. On 1QpHab 9:3–7 Stuckenbruck observes: “The time of the priest [in 1QpHab 8:13–9:2, PBH] . . . is distinguished from the time of the ‘last priests,’ whose deeds are deliberately referred to in the imperfect” (143).
- 52 “The Kittim in the Qumran Pesharim,” in *Images of Empire*, ed. Loveday Alexander, JSOTSup 122 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 135–59 (141).
- 53 The hermeneutics of this passage may be another indication of its secondary nature. The subject of “they inflicted” (עשו) in 1QpHab 9:2 may correspond with “all remaining nations” (כול יתר עמים) in Hab 2:8a (quoted as a lemma in 1QpHab 8:13–15), rather than with “your creditors” (נושכ׳ך) and “those that oppress you” (מוזעזיעיכה) in Hab 2:7. If the passage is so read, the second quotation of Hab 2:8a is redundant, unless it is added to an existing Peshar. Though not agreeing with the hermeneutical explanation offered here, William H. Brownlee assumes that “Hab 2:8a is quoted anew, having been used previously indirectly in the interpretation of 2:7” (*The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*, SBLMS 24 [Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979], 151). Bilhah Nitzan, too, refers to the interpretation of Hab 2:8a in 1QpHab 9:3–7 as “a second *pēšer* on ‘for you have spoiled many peoples’” (*Peshar Habakkuk: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (1QpHab) [Jerusalem: Bialik, 1986], 182 [Hebrew]).
- 54 References follow Devorah Dimant, DJD 30. On the problems with Dimant’s edition see Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, “Classifications of the Collection of Dead Sea Scrolls and the Case of *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*,” *JSJ* 43 (2012): 519–50 (esp. 531–44). For a composite text of this passage (on the basis of 4Q385a and other witnesses) see Kipp Davis, *The Cave 4 Apocryphon of Jeremiah and the Qumran, Jeremianic Traditions: Prophetic Persona and the Construction of Community Identity*, STDJ 111 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 154–56.

The historical referents of the expressions in Peshar Habakkuk, Peshar Hosea B, and the Apocryphon cannot be recovered with certainty. It is possible, however, that by conflating the expressions from Peshar Hosea B and the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C,<sup>55</sup> the exegete responsible for 1QpHab 9:3–7 consciously invents a new expression which evokes a different historical situation.<sup>56</sup>

When consulting the various editions of the Qumran scrolls one can find some terminological overlap between 1QpHab 9:3–7 and Peshar Nahum (4Q169 3–4 i 11–12) as well. But caution is in order here. 4Q169 3–4 i 11–12 has been preserved very fragmentarily, and many reconstructions in these lines are in fact based on 1QpHab 9:3–7.<sup>57</sup> In view of PAM photo 41.943, the identification of “prey” (טרפה) in Nah 2:14 with “the wealth that they amassed” (ההון אשר קבצו) is probable.<sup>58</sup> The subject of the plural verb has been taken by

55 Again, we may wonder if Peshar Hosea B and the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C served as sources for the composer of 1QpHab 9:3–7. John Strugnell dates 4Q167 to the Herodian period (“Notes en marge du volume v des ‘Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,’” *RevQ* 7/26 [1970]: 163–276 [199, 201]); the manuscript may thus be contemporary with 1QpHab 9:3–7. Dimant dates the various manuscripts of Apocryphon of Jeremiah C to the late Hasmonaean or Early Herodian era (DJD 30), whereas Davis prefers a dating in the first quarter of the first century CE for 4Q387 (*The Cave 4 Apocryphon of Jeremiah*, 94–95).

56 Below I will tentatively side with those scholars who think that 1QpHab 9:3–7 has the demise of the Hasmonaean dynasty in view. “The last priest” in Peshar Hosea B is commonly identified with Alexander Jannaeus. The reason for this identification is twofold and depends on Peshar Nahum: 1) the interpretation section preceding this passage in *Peshar Hosea B* (4Q167 2 1–2) mentions “the Young Lion of Wrath” (כפיר ההרון), an expression which in *Peshar Nahum* seems to refer to Alexander Jannaeus; 2) “the last priest” is portrayed as striking “Ephraim,” just as in Peshar Nahum the Young Lion of Wrath is said to strike “the simple ones of Ephraim” (4Q169 3–4 i 6). For this view see most elaborately Berrin (Tzoref), *The Peshar Nahum Scroll*, 104–9 (with references). For a challenge of this view see Gregory L. Doudna, *4Q Peshar Nahum: A Critical Edition*, JSPSup 35, c1S 8 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 557–73, who identifies the Young Lion of Wrath in both Peshar Nahum and Peshar Hosea B with a gentile ruler. The last priest, in Doudna’s view, “is the 4QpHos<sup>b</sup> equivalent to the Wicked Priest of 1QpHab and Manasseh of 4QpNah” (569) and a victim of the Young Lion of Wrath.

Dimant situates 4Q387 2 iii 6 in the reign of Antiochus IV and writes that “the priests of Jerusalem” are “the Hasmonaean kings and the Temple priesthood” (DJD 30:188). Davis, *The Cave 4 Apocryphon of Jeremiah*, 163–64 agrees.

57 See John M. Allegro, DJD 5:41; Maurya P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, CBQMS 8 (Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979), 181; Berrin (Tzoref), *The Peshar Nahum Scroll*, 58.

58 Elisha Qimron draws attention to this PAM photo, which contains a larger part of the *bet* of קבצו and clearer traces of ההון than later PAM photos (*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:283 [in the

many scholars to be “the priests of Jerusalem,” which would yield an interesting parallel with 1QpHab 9:3–7. Yet, only the toponym and the final *yod* of כוהני are visible; hence the reading ירושלם כוהני is possible, but not certain. In the end, therefore, the extent of overlap between 1QpHab 9:3–7 and Peshar Nahum cannot be determined exactly.<sup>59</sup>

#### 4 Eschatological Expectation and Literary History

Having argued that 1QpHab 2:5–10 and 1QpHab 9:3–7 are additions to Peshar Habakkuk, I now go one step further. In my view, these two passages are not isolated additions, but belong together and constitute a literary layer in Peshar Habakkuk. This literary layer is characterized by an explicitly eschatological outlook.

The eschatological character of these two passages is evident from their use of the term אחרית הימים, which features only in these passages in Peshar Habakkuk. This is not to argue that other events in the Peshar were not considered to occur in “the latter days,” but that the eschatological setting is more prominent in 1QpHab 2:5–10 and 1QpHab 9:3–7 than elsewhere in this Peshar.<sup>60</sup> Nor does this explicitly eschatological setting in 1QpHab 2:5–10 and 1QpHab 9:3–7 imply that their contents must be situated squarely in the future: as the composer of these lines considered himself to live in the latter days, the reference to אחרית הימים has both contemporary and future significance. When speaking of “the latter days,” the present and the future in these passages blend into one.<sup>61</sup>

---

apparatus]). See <http://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-280385> (last accessed 8 September, 2016) for the image.

59 Nor is it evident how to envision the chronological relationship between 1QpHab 9:3–7 and *Peshar Nahum*. 4Q169 is dated to the transition from the Hasmonaean to the Herodian era (Strugnell, “Notes en marge,” 205) and, thus, might be slightly older than 1QpHab 9:3–7. This does not mean, however, that 4Q169 served as a direct source for the composer of 1QpHab 9:3–7.

60 On אחרית הימים having already begun see Annette Steudel, “אחרית הימים” in the Texts from Qumran,” *RevQ* 16/62 (1993): 225–44; Berrin (Tzoref), *The Peshar Nahum Scroll*, 214.

61 This raises problems for modern studies on “Qumran eschatology” which treat the topic together with “Qumran messianism.” Even if the topics are clearly related, messianic figures are almost without exception expected in the future. “The latter days,” however, are a lived reality in the sectarian writings and incorporate aspects of the present and the future. See, e.g., Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood*, who does not discuss the Priest in 1QpHab 2:5–10 as an eschatological priest, despite the explicit reference

This eschatological perspective in 1QpHab 2:5–10 and 1QpHab 9:3–7 is a response to the contents of earlier strata in Peshier Habakkuk. In 1QpHab 6:12–7:14, the Teacher of Righteousness, having received a fuller revelation than the ancient prophets, is portrayed as having been granted divine insight in what was to happen in the latter days, before “the end of time.”<sup>62</sup> When exactly the end would come the Teacher, like the prophet Habakkuk, did not know, as this is in principle beyond human scrutiny (cf. 1QpHab 7:13–14).<sup>63</sup> The Teacher is not portrayed here as one who had calculated the end of time but failed to get it right,<sup>64</sup> but as one who urges his followers to remain faithful and endure as the time of the end remains unknown. As Baumgarten has recently argued, the Teacher in 1QpHab 7 is an owl claiming that the night continues rather than a rooster declaring that the morning is dawning. In Baumgarten’s words: “All [the Teacher] knew and taught was that [the end of time] would definitely come and come soon, whenever God in the mysteries of His prudence chose.”<sup>65</sup> This knowledge has its basis in Scripture. After all, Scripture itself declares that the end will come, even if it tarries (Hab 2:3b). In the words of the Peshier, this is to say that “the final period shall be long and extend beyond everything the prophets have spoken” (1QpHab 7:7–8).

In comparison with earlier strata of Peshier Habakkuk 1QpHab 2:5–10 and 1QpHab 9:3–7 exhibit an increased eschatological interest.<sup>66</sup> The collocation “the last priests of Jerusalem” fosters a worldview in which certain priests are the last ones—that is, the last ones before the judgement, which the army of the Kittim shall execute. Moreover, both passages stress the relevance of

---

to the latter days in this passage. Cf. also how Grant Macaskill speaks of “inaugurated eschatology” as a kind of eschatology “that contains both realised and future elements” (*Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, JSJSup 115 [Leiden: Brill, 2007], 24–25).

62 On the latter days as the period before “the end of time” (גמר הקץ) see Steudel, “אחרית, הימים.”

63 Scholars have often argued that the Teacher, unlike the prophet Habakkuk, did know the end of time. For a critique of this view see Jokiranta, *Social Identity and Sectarianism*, 166–70.

64 This is suggested by Steudel, “אחרית הימים,” 235–36. She draws on Stegemann’s view that the Essenes had calculated the end to come in 70 BCE; see *The Library of Qumran*, 123–25, 128–29.

65 “What Did the ‘Teacher’ Know? Owls and Roosters in the Qumran Barnyard,” in *Keter Shem Tov*, 235–57 (252).

66 This interest may well reflect the changed attitudes of the followers of the Teacher, who, even if they did not expect the end to occur at a certain date, may have developed a more intense eschatological interest as the latter days endured.

prophetic Scripture to understand what will happen in the latter days. The phrase “for these are the rest of the peoples” (1QpHab 9:7), if it indeed belongs with the rest of 1QpHab 9:3–7,<sup>67</sup> directs the reader of the Peshet to its base text and emphasizes that what is to happen in the latter days can be found in the ancient prophets. The phrase “through whom God told all that is to befall his people Israel” in 1QpHab 2:9–10 fulfils the same purpose: it stresses the immediate pertinence of the contents of prophetic Scripture with regard to the latter days. Lastly, the absence of the term “mystery” (מִסְתֵּרִים) from 1QpHab 2:8–9 in comparison to 1QpHab 7:5 might suggest that the “*mysteries* of the words of his servants the prophets” are about to be realized—that is, will soon cease to be a mystery. Taken together, these details indicate the more urgent eschatological concerns in 1QpHab 2:5–10 and 1QpHab 9:3–7 in comparison with the earlier strata of Peshet Habakkuk. The composers of these two passages are acutely aware of the fact that they are living in the latter days and that history is drawing quickly to its end.

Apart from the reference to “the latter days” 1QpHab 2:5–10 and 1QpHab 9:3–7 share an interest in priests and the priesthood. This interest may reflect the historical background of 1QpHab 9:3–7. In spite of the problems that accompany any attempt to draw historical information from the Peshetarim, it seems probable that the phrase “the last priests of Jerusalem” recalls the end of the Hasmonaean dynasty.<sup>68</sup> If so, this reference to the Hasmonaean dynasty may be contrasted with the reference to an eschatological priest in 1QpHab 2:5–10. Perhaps the demise of one group of priests (the Hasmonaean) triggered a renewed attention to and the expectation of a Priest of a different category in the latter days. As we have seen, the activity of this eschatological Priest is not merely something of the future: it is already under way. As he exemplifies the work of the Peshet commentators, the type of activity associated with this eschatological Priest (interpreting [פִּשְׁטָרִים] the words of the prophets) finds its clearest expression in the Qumran commentaries themselves. Thus, the reference to the Priest in 1QpHab 2:5–10, when read in conjunction with the mention of “the last priests of Jerusalem” in 1QpHab 9:3–7, may portray the work of the Peshet commentators as a counterpart to the waning Hasmonaean dynasty.

67 See below.

68 So Adam S. van der Woude, “Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Commentary,” *JJS* 33 (1982): 349–59 (352); Michael A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community*, CQWJCW 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 240.

## 5 Literary Growth and the Production of 1QpHab

If the suggestion that 1QpHab 9:3–7 reflects the demise of the Hasmonaean dynasty is accepted, this may provide a date in the middle of the 1st century BCE for the addition of 1QpHab 2:5–10 and 1QpHab 9:3–7 to Peshar Habakkuk. After all, the Hasmonaean dynasty came to its end in 37 BCE, after Mattathias Antigonus’ short-lived rule (40–37 BCE) and the appointment of Herod as king by the Romans in 40 BCE. This date makes it unlikely that the addition of 1QpHab 2:5–10 and 1QpHab 9:3–7 to Peshar Habakkuk coincided with the production of 1QpHab. In the early years of Qumran scholarship, the date of this manuscript was estimated at 25 BCE–25 CE.<sup>69</sup> Modern scholars tend to date it between 1–50 CE.<sup>70</sup> If this later dating is accepted, the sole surviving manuscript of Peshar Habakkuk may postdate the addition of 1QpHab 2:5–10 and 1QpHab 9:3–7 by several decades.

Some physical features of 1QpHab support the suggestion that the production of 1QpHab does not coincide with the addition of 1QpHab 2:5–10 and 1QpHab 9:3–7 to Peshar Habakkuk. The phrase “for these are the rest of the peoples” in 1QpHab 9:7 is set apart from its co-text by an unexpected *vacat*. If this *vacat* points to a process of reworking, its presence in 1QpHab 9:3–7 shows that at least one copy of Peshar Habakkuk must have been produced after the insertion of these lines. Likewise, the *’aleph* at the end of 1QpHab 2:6, if it indeed marks the secondary nature of 1QpHab 2:5–10, may have been placed there by the scribe of 1QpHab. Marginal signs, Emanuel Tov notes, often indicate points of interest to later readers of particular passages rather than to their original scribes.<sup>71</sup> So, if this *’aleph* points to the secondary character of 1QpHab 2:5–10, it probably originates not with the composer of these lines, but with a later reader—possibly the scribe of 1QpHab. As he was copying his *Vorlage*, this scribe may have been struck by these lines (just as modern readers of 1QpHab are) and marked it with a sign.

69 John C. Trever, “A Paleographic Study of the Jerusalem Scrolls,” *BASOR* 113 (1949): 6–23.

70 See Maurice Baillet, *DJD* 3:72; Brian Webster, *DJD* 39:426; Annette Steudel, “Dating Exegetical Texts from Qumran,” in *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran*, ed. Deborah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz, *FAT* 35 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 39–53 (47) (in order of dependence).

71 *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, *STDJ* 54 (Leiden: Brill, 2004; repr., Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 19, 208.

## 6 Conclusion

Although only one manuscript of each Peshet was preserved in the Qumran caves, the Qumran commentaries are not the result of a fixed and stable tradition. Instead, the Pesharim participate in an open-ended and living tradition of scholarship and exegesis. The workings of this living tradition, whose origins are attributed to the Teacher of Righteousness, are reflected in the Peshet manuscripts at our disposal. The scribes of these manuscripts felt free to incorporate interpretative insights in the manuscripts they were producing, just as scribes of scriptural manuscripts felt free to produce “interventionist” manuscripts of Scripture.<sup>72</sup> The scribal attitudes reflected in 1QpHab and interventionist copies of Scripture are very similar.<sup>73</sup>

These observations situate the Pesharim in the realm of scholarly and metatextual literature. Scholarly writings such as commentaries, glosses, *scholia*, or lexicæ are often part of a fluid tradition. They tend to be in active use within a community of students and readers of literary classics, allowing access to these classics by interpreting them. As they are used, these scholarly writings tend to accumulate, lose, or alter exegetical material. The driving force behind this living tradition are the changing interests of students and readers that gain access to the classics through a commentary. In the case discussed in this article, these interests assumed an eschatological shape. As they studied the prophets in the vein of the Teacher, later interpreters added their expectation that the latter days will see the arrival of a Priest explaining the prophets like the Teacher and their reassurance that the end of time is truly near, to the existing Peshet.

---

72 The term “interventionist” comes from D. Andrew Teeter, *Scribal Laws: Exegetical Variation in the Textual Transmission of Biblical Law in the Late Second Temple Period*, FAT 92 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

73 This supports Charlotte Hempel’s suggestion that there are no clear boundaries between the scribal milieux in which Scripture and the sectarian literature were transmitted and produced. See “The Emerging Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Common Milieu,” in *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context: Collected Studies*, TSAJ 154 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 285–99. See also Reinhard G. Kratz, *Historical and Biblical Israel: The History, Tradition, and Archives of Israel and Judah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 61–74.