

Did Qumran Expect Two Messiahs?

L. D. HURST
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

It has long been held that the Qumran community expected not one but two Messiahs. This assumption has often been accompanied by the act of translating the Hebrew term māšīah in Qumran literature as "Messiah" (with or without the capital "m") rather than as "anointed." The Qumran texts themselves do not necessarily support this viewpoint. A careful examination of the most important literature reveals that the multiple messiahship of Qumran is a creation of modern scholars, not a fact required by the texts themselves.

Key words: Messiahs, anointed, Damascus Document, diarchy

I. INTRODUCTION

To students of Judaism and early Christianity there is probably no more familiar concept than that of "the Messiah." The "messianic" beliefs of what was once called "normative Judaism"¹ and of Christianity, furthermore, are usually viewed as relatively clear in their definitions. Both Jews and Christians looked forward to the coming of a deliverer, a Messiah from the line of David, who would right all wrongs and introduce the final age of human history. The two movements, Judaism and Christianity, then parted ways largely on the basis of identifying who that figure was.

Then the situation radically changed. With the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, our "clear" picture of Second Temple Judaism—not to mention of first-century Jewish Christianity—began significantly to blur. Scholars of Judaism now spoke of Second Temple Judaism, for instance, not as a monolithic block, but as something more like a kaleidoscope. "Judaisms"² gradually became the more characteristic

1. Cf. George Foot Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927-30).

2. Cf., e.g., J. Neusner, W. S. Green, and E. Frerichs (eds.), *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

way of speaking of the religious situation into which Jesus would have been born.

Also, for the first time, it was said, there was clear evidence of at least one Jewish group that expected not one but *two* future figures—two "Messiahs." This belief was subsequently said to provide a clearer picture of the concepts with which the early Christians were working when they made their revolutionary claims for Jesus of Nazareth. Accordingly, he fulfilled the twofold ancient expectation of the Messiah—king *and* priest. Thus was born the thesis that the Qumran community had a dual expectation of a "Messiah of Aaron" and a "Messiah of Israel," a thesis that continues to be the view most widely accepted by scholars working on the Dead Sea materials.³ But does the evidence of Qumran literature—not to mention that of the NT—support such a view? In attempting to answer this question, I shall examine the history of the debate, while attempting a fresh evaluation of the evidence to which appeal continues to be made, if only to challenge scholars to rethink one of the most commonly accepted beliefs of recent scholarly study.

II. "MESSIAH" OR "ANOINTED"?

It has occasionally been said that the term *māšîaḥ* was never adopted as a distinct title—a *terminus technicus*—before the Christian movement.⁴ It is not possible here to examine the merits of this dubious

3. In addition to those cited below, scholars working on the Dead Sea materials who accept a dual messianism at Qumran include James VanderKam, "Messianism in the Scrolls," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (ed. Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993) 211ff.; John J. Collins, "Messiahs in Context: Method in the Study of Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site* (ed. M. O. Wise et al.; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994) 213ff.; idem, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995) 74ff.; and W. H. Schniedewind, "Structural Aspects of Qumran Messianism in the Damascus Document," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: New Texts, Reformulated Issues, and Technological Innovations* (ed. D. W. Parry and E. C. Ulrich; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 523-36.

4. M. de Jonge ("The Use of the Word 'Anointed' in the Time of Jesus," *NovT* 8 [1966] 134) denies the existence of any fixed content to the messianic hope in the first century BCE. Regarding the use of *māšîaḥ* as a title, he maintains "the relative unimportance of the term in the context of Jewish expectations concerning the future, at least in the Jewish sources at our disposal for the period." De Jonge bases his claim on the relatively few times the term appears in pre-Christian Jewish literature. But cf. R. N. Longenecker, for whom de Jonge "fails to take into account the semitic habit of stressing functions over persons" (*The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity* [Naperville: Allenson, 1970] 64 n. 8). Furthermore, claims Longenecker, the fact that no rabbi before the destruction of Jerusalem can be cited as using *māšîaḥ* in an absolute sense, or that the term is absent in Josephus, is not overly valuable as evidence: "Material directly attributable to specific pre-destruction rabbis is itself very scarce, and Josephus desired to play down this element before his Roman audience" (p. 65).

claim. Perhaps it is enough to say that the beginning student may rest confident in assuming that the Qumran evidence (most of which will be examined below) lends decisive weight to the view that such usage was indeed pre-Christian.

The *nature* of that pre-Christian messianism, on the other hand, has not been so easily agreed upon by those who have determined its facticity. How *many* "Messiahs" were expected at Qumran? *When* would they arrive? By whom, if any, would he (or they) be *accompanied*? These, and other critical questions, continue to perplex historians of Second Temple Judaism and of early Christianity, as they have now for nearly a century. But with the availability of the Qumran materials we now have the opportunity to study at first hand a Jewish sect (from its own writings) that expected a future deliverer (or deliverers) in a way that may or may not approximate the hope that predominates in the NT writings.

At the very outset of our study, the thoughtful student will be faced with an enormous double-question: should the Hebrew term *māšīah* be translated "Messiah" or "anointed"? Or—perhaps more importantly—should it be capitalized when it occurs in Qumran literature?

There is nothing pedantic about such questions. Because it is commonly felt that the term *māšīah* was used by the Qumran community as a "title" that refers to a distinct eschatological figure, many continue to render it "Messiah." By doing so they understand it to be a proper noun.⁵ But those who read the voluminous secondary literature on Qumran "messiahship" may at this point be befuddled. A wide array of other scholars choose to render the term messiah(s) as "anointed," uncapitalized.⁶ Still others eschew "Messiah" altogether,

5. Others have taken a more cautious approach. C. F. Pfeiffer (*The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible* [Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1969] 131), noting the varied uses of the term, concludes that "we must be careful lest the term *māšīah* always be interpreted in the sense of an eschatological figure." L. H. Silberman ("The Two 'Messiahs' in the Manual of Discipline," *VT* 5 [1955] 78-79) attacks the "tendentious practice" (with Millar Burrows and W. H. Brownlee the chief offenders) of "translating by not translating, using a word that has been naturalized as a technical term into English or other Western tongues as a translation of its source in Hebrew, where the same technical meaning may not necessarily be present. This 'crime' is compounded by capitalization" (p. 78). He continues: "Thus no one seems to have any compunction about translating *mšwḥ* or *mšyh* as Messiah with a capital M, ignoring the palpable fact that Messiah is a word loaded with two millennia of connotations beyond its use in our MS" (*ibid.*).

6. The problem is compounded when scholars are not self-consistent. R. E. Brown, for instance ("J. Starcky's Theory of Qumran Messianic Development," *CBQ* 28 [1966] 56), claims that "it seems far more plausible in our judgment to maintain that from the Hasmonean period on there was at Qumran an expectation of two Messiahs, a special king and a special priest, anointed (and hence messiahs) as kings and priests would be, whom God would raise up in the final times to deliver His people, i.e., the Qumran community." The reader will be understandably puzzled as to why the first use of "Messiah"

choosing "anointed," with or without the capital *a*. It would be helpful if Qumran specialists were one day to achieve some consensus on the question. But in view of the confusion that continues to arise from the variety of interpretations surrounding the Qumran references, this is unlikely in the extreme.

The implications of choosing "messiah," especially when capitalized, are enormous. Each time *māšīaḥ* is used in Qumran literature, so one is given to believe, it indicates a religious figure of *distinct and definable contours*. But could the situation be much more complex than this? Does the possibility exist, in theory at least, that the Qumran sect used the term *māšīaḥ* on some occasions in an *indistinct* sense, "anointed," or (even more confusingly) in *more than one* sense? Could it refer *both* to "the Anointed One," "the Messiah" of traditional Jewish and Christian expectation, and to one or more "anointed ones" (priests and/or prophets)? Uncertainty abounds. It has even sometimes been questioned whether there was a hope at Qumran of a Messiah at all.⁷

So as not to create more confusion, I should indicate my position at the outset. My working assumption is that strong evidence exists for claiming that the Qumran Community used the term *māšīaḥ* in at least *two* ways: (1) as a *terminus technicus* for the expected Davidic redeemer—"the Messiah"; and (2), less distinctly, as a term for the anointed priest who will be functioning at the time the Davidic figure appears, and through whom, with the Messiah, God will work out His purposes for Israel and the world. The crucial texts, in other words, while *appearing* to say the same thing, may in fact be using the same or similar language to say radically different things.⁸

III. THE CRUCIAL TEXTS

1. *The Damascus Document (CD)*

I turn now to the most important passages in Qumran literature that may (or may not) speak of multiple messianic figures. One of the most

is capitalized, while the second is not. The same is true of S. Talmon, "The Concepts of *Māšīaḥ* and Messianism in Early Judaism," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1992) 79-115. There (pp. 104-15) "Messiah," "Anointed," and "anointed" are used in bewildering succession, with no apparent rationale for the variation in capitalization and terminology.

7. "Strangely enough," comments W. S. LaSor (*The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Faith* [Chicago: Moody, 1962] 152), "the scholars have spent little time debating the question whether there was a Messiah in Qumran eschatology; rather they have debated whether there were two Messiahs."

8. Here it will be clear that I am in agreement with the general approach of M. G. Abegg, "The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?" *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995) 125-44.

discussed texts continues to be the so-called *Damascus Document* (hereafter referred to as CD). Whatever controversy may continue to exist around these passages has largely resulted from the fact that CD references reproduce a text that we already knew of from other sources but that contains four passages in which the term "*māšīaḥ* of Aaron and Israel" occurs (although the last is a restoration):

CD 9b:10 (19:10-11)⁹ *bbw mšyh 'hrn wys'l* "when the *māšīaḥ* comes from Aaron and Israel"

CD 9b:29 (20:1): *°d °mwd mwd mšyh m 'hrn wmysr'l* "until there arises the *māšīaḥ* from Aaron and from Israel"

CD 15:4 (12:23-13:1): *°d mwd mšwh 'hrn wys'l* "until there arises the *māšīaḥ* of Aaron and Israel"

CD 18:7 (14:19): [*mšw*]h *'hrwn wys'l* "the *māšīaḥ* of Aaron and Israel"¹⁰

When Solomon Schechter first published the Cairo version of these texts, it might have been natural to adopt the "surface" meaning of the phrase: *one* anointed one from the whole community. But those familiar with the rabbinic doctrine of a plurality of Messiahs had their reasons for disagreeing. For them the phrase must mean *two* anointed ones, two "Messiahs." Here one might point to *Midr. Ps.43:6*, which, while post-Christian, almost certainly embodies an older tradition:

To that generation [in Egypt] you sent redemption through two redeemers, as it is said (Ps 105:26), "He sent Moses, his servant, and Aaron whom he had chosen." And also to this generation [in the Messianic age] he sends two, corresponding to the other two: "Send out your light and your truth" (Ps 43:3). "Your light," that is, the prophet Elijah of the house of Aaron, of whom it is written (Num 8:2), "the seven lamps shall throw their light in front of the lampstand." And "your truth," that is, Messiah ben David, as is said (Ps 132:11), "the Lord has sworn to David in truth, he will not turn from it." And likewise it is said (Isa 42:1), "Behold your servant whom I uphold."¹¹

While here the "messiahship" of the Elijah figure may be questioned (he is not called *māšīaḥ*), the analogy of these two eschatological figures to "light" and "truth" is striking, and some have suggested that

9. Following the chapter and verse enumeration of R. H. Charles (for bibliographic information see n. 12 below).

10. For a fuller exposition of the four references, along with extremely detailed discussion, cf. Abegg, "Seeing Double," 127-28; and B. Z. Wacholder and M. G. Abegg (eds.), *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four*, fascicle one [Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1992] 20.

11. I owe this quotation to Pfeiffer, *Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible*, 130.

it indicates an equality. Several other midrashes contain the notion of more than one Messiah. *Num. Rab.* 14, for example, mentions *four* eschatological figures: Elijah, the Messiah of Manasseh, the Messiah of Ephraim, and "the great redeemer of the line of David." Talmud R. Dosa (CE 250), on the other hand, goes back to the notion of two messianic figures: Messiah ben Joseph and Messiah ben David. It is the fate of the former to be killed in battle against the forces of Belial (later designated as Armilus [Romulus] = Rome).

2. *Enter the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*

At this point it will be expeditious to break off consideration of the *Damascus Document* and turn to another group of writings which has been almost continuously drawn into the discussion. Virtually since the year the Scrolls were first discovered (1947), the documents known as *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* have occupied center stage in Qumran debate. Since they might (or might not) shed light on the CD references, a number of scholars have adopted the view that, because a plural "messianism" was demonstrated in the *Testaments* long before the Scrolls were discovered, it need have surprised no one that such a doctrine appears in the CD references and other Qumran literature. Unfortunately, so the argument continues, the reconstruction of the history of the *Testaments* by R. H. Charles retarded our understanding.

Here some background is necessary. According to Charles,¹² the passages that speak of a Messiah from Levi and a Messiah from Judah (found interspersed throughout the *Testaments*) demonstrate two *competing* concepts: originally, however, only one figure—a Messiah of Levi (who was *both* king and priest)—was mentioned in the archetypal text of the *Testaments*.¹³ This archetypal text, so Charles continued, was composed by a Pharisee during the Hasmonean dynasty, with the "Messiah of Levi" references indicating the Hasmonean priest-kings.¹⁴ But when John Hyrcanus (137-107 BCE) parted company with the Pharisees, a new idea ("the Messiah of Judah") was introduced into the text. Charles dated the final rescension near the

12. R. H. Charles, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (London: Black, 1908). For a helpful review of Charles's position, cf. M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Leiden: Brill, 1953) 10-12.

13. Cf., e.g., *Levi* 18:2ff., which seems to combine priestly, kingly, and prophetic roles.

14. In *T. Levi* 8:14 the priesthood is to be known by "a new name." Charles understood this name to be "priests of the Most High God," a title applied to the Hasmonean priest-kings in, among other texts, Josephus and the Talmud.

end of Hyrcanus' reign¹⁵ and interpreted the "Messiah of Judah" as a reference to him.¹⁶

Charles's reconstruction of the *Testaments* was clearly defective, and those who have criticized it have had ample reasons for so doing. In an intensive examination of the *Testaments*, for instance, G. R. Beasley-Murray¹⁷ argued that "the juxtaposition of the Messiah from Judah and the Messiah from Levi is too deeply rooted in the fabric of the book for either element to be discarded. Apart from the Christian interpolations the book is essentially a unity."¹⁸ Whether this judgment will be supported by the mainstream of scholarly opinion may continue to be one of the sources of debate in the near future.

The "Testaments" claim to be the dying remarks of each of the twelve sons of Jacob, in which are outlined the fortunes of their tribal descendants. In one passage, *T. Reuben* (6:7-12),¹⁹ it is virtually certain that not only is the high priestly authority given to Levi but also *the temporal political sovereignty*. K. G. Kuhn²⁰ (to mention just one respected writer) rightly agrees with Charles in assigning such a statement to the situation under the Hasmoneans but differs from him in

15. According to Charles, *T. Levi* 6:11 clearly alludes to the destruction of Samaria, which indicates that it should be dated between 109 and 107 BCE.

16. Other explanations were offered. K. Kohler (*The Jewish Encyclopedia* [New York, 1901-6] 12.113) assigned the Messiah from Levi to a later, secondary edition, while seeing the Messiah from Judah as the original figure (in accord with most of Judaism). P. Aptovitzer, *Parteipolitik der Hasmonäerzeit* (Vienna, 1927), went even further than Charles, claiming that the Testaments are a polemical tract against opponents of the Hasmoneans that tried to show that the Hasmonean rulers descended from Levi and Judah. "The starting point of the debate," says J. Liver, "The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs in Sectarian Literature in the Time of the Second Commonwealth," *HTR* 52 (1959) 165 (quoting Aptovitzer), was "the exposition of Ps. 110:4. . . . The Hasmonean party claimed that according to this verse a priest would be the Messiah, while their opponents thought the same verse meant that the Messiah (who would be from the tribe of Judah) would also be a priest."

17. G. R. Beasley-Murray, "The Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *JTS* 48 (1947) 1. See also K. Schubert, "Zwei Messiasse aus dem Regelbuch von Chirbet Qumran," *Judaica* 11 (1955); and idem, "Testament Juda 24 im Lichte der Texte von Chirbet Qumran," *WZKM* 53 (1957) 227-36. Against Beasley-Murray's view, cf. A. J. B. Higgins, "Priest and Messiah," *VT* 3 (1953) 321-36. Higgins (p. 330) claims that "The essential unity of the *Testaments* (apart from Christian additions) would be saved by this theory of two Messiahs. But this is untenable. It is impossible to hold to the unity of a book which contains such irreconcilable beliefs—a Messiah from Levi; a Messiah from Judah; a high priest from Levi accompanied by a Messiah from Judah."

18. This may need to be qualified, however, now that we know that *T. Levi* appears to have existed at Qumran as a separate work (see below).

19. For an English translation, cf. H. C. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (Second Century BC)," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Vol. 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983) 784-85.

20. K. G. Kuhn, "The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1975) 64.

his claim that the *Testaments* point to two competing concepts that can be assigned to differing stages.

The relevance of the *Testaments* to Qumran literature will doubtless remain a question of delicate scholarly judgment, and I have no expectations here of resolving the dispute. What is beyond question, on the other hand, is that the temporary situation under the Hasmoneans was never accepted by the first-century Palestinian Jews. They remained careful to maintain a separation of "church and state," a division between the high priesthood and the political government. It was only by the intervention of the Roman general Pompey (63 BCE) that the Hasmoneans were deprived of the kingship, insuring and reestablishing the Davidic character of the political rulership. This Davidic kingship, furthermore, was (apart from the time of the Hasmoneans) always concentrated in the *people* of Israel. He was their representative. For "the average Jew" only one Messiah was to come. This was the Davidic, royal figure who later surfaces in the NT, "not the special two-Messiah doctrine of the Essenes."²¹

Such an "orthodox," single-Messiah conception²² is probably reflected in the oracle of Judah to his sons in *T. Judah* 21:1-5,²³ while elsewhere (*T. Judah* 24) the oracle of Balaam (Num 24:17) was interpreted as "the Star" (the priestly figure) and "the scepter" (the royal figure).²⁴ Kuhn and those who have followed him have seen in this subordination of kingship to priesthood the doctrine of two Messiahs that they saw in the four CD passages. "Thus," claims Kuhn, "information about this very form of messianic expectation was available before it was found in the Qumran texts." Had it not been for Charles, continues Kuhn, "the additional evidence of the Scrolls were [sic] hardly necessary."²⁵ Kuhn's case appeared to be strengthened by the discovery among the scrolls of fragments of the *Testaments* in an earlier rescension than was formerly known. Hence "it is even now more obvious" that the *Testaments* belong "to the body of Qumran literature."²⁶

21. Ibid. It should be remembered that Kuhn believed the *Testaments* to "belong to the cycle of Essene writings" (ibid., 58) F. F. Bruce (*Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* [London, 1960] 37) refers to the two-Messiah doctrine as "an isolated conception." So also Liver, 183.

22. Except possibly for the extreme degree of subordination of the king to the priest (cf. also *T. Naphtali* 5:1-3), where the king and priest are compared to the moon and the sun, respectively.

23. Translation Kee's, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," 800.

24. Oddly enough, points out Brown ("J. Starcky's Theory," 64 n. 57), in *T. Levi* 18:3 the star is made to refer to the priest from Levi. Perhaps we have here one of those "irreconcilable beliefs" spoken of by Higgins.

25. Kuhn, "Two Messiahs," 58.

26. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis*, 37.

Kuhn's zeal, on the other hand, might have been held in check on at least one pivotal point. It is plausible that only *source-material* for what we today call "the *Testaments*" (i.e., our Greek text) is represented at Qumran.²⁷ In this context it is significant that Milik himself, arch-advocate of the two-Messiah theory, finds himself forced to observe that "no trace has been found at Qumran of the Hebrew or Aramaic archetype which some scholars have assumed to be the basis for our present Greek text."²⁸ Milik later suggested that what we now know as the *Testaments* is in fact the work of a later editor (a Jewish Christian of the first or second century CE?) who adapted material being circulated as far back as the first century BCE.²⁹ Thus if the Greek text bears a Christian stamp—a big "if"—and if the Christian additions cannot readily be labeled as interpolations, we are almost certainly dealing with a work of Christian rather than Jewish origin.³⁰ (It should be noted that Milik, on the other hand, was loath to assign any of the passages concerning the two-Messiah doctrine to the category of Christian interpolation.)

But here two additional questions surface. If certain Christian influences are admitted in the *Testaments*, does not the whole document become suspect, with the task of sorting out the earlier source material from its Christian redactor becoming, in all practicality, implausible? (2) If we accept the view of a Christian redactor, why then "was he satisfied to leave some two messiah passages as he reworked others to reflect Christian doctrine—a shortsighted procedure at best."³¹

The numerous problems that persist concerning the manner in which the *Testaments* were used by Milik, Kuhn, and others may be summarized as follows:

27. Some comment should be made about the nature of the fragments. Most of the secondary literature on the subject was generated before 1991, before word was beginning to leak out concerning the unpublished fragments from Cave 4. Until then, all that had been identified was an Aramaic fragment of *Levi* (Cave 1), Aramaic fragments of several long additions to *Levi* previously preserved only in a Greek copy at Mount Athos, and a Hebrew fragment of *Naphtali*, preserving the genealogy of Bilhah (cf. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* [Naperville: Allenson], 1959] 34). Now, of course, we have the transcription of the Cave 4 texts by Wacholder and Abegg, *Preliminary Edition*, fascicle 1, pp. 1-59.

28. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery*, 34.

29. *T. Levi* may have existed as a separate work at Qumran (cf. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," 776; and Wacholder and Abegg, *Preliminary Edition*).

30. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery*, 34-35.

31. Abegg, "Seeing Double," 129. Abegg suggests that "a similar dual/singular phenomenon in the *Testaments* . . . should be interpreted as parallel to the evidence at Qumran rather than as the result of a later Christian redactor" (p. 144).

1. The dating of the *Testaments* vis-à-vis the Qumran literature that is normally cited (most obviously CD and 1QS) remains tentative at best.
2. Possible post-Christian additions may indicate that what we call the *Testaments* (the Greek text at least) was at best a unified, Christian document. If so, the task of sorting out the Christian additions from the supposed earlier text then becomes horrendously difficult, if even possible.
3. It is not clear that the priestly figure of the scrolls is the same as that of the *Testaments*.
4. The priest from Levi in the *Testaments* is never described as "Messiah" (contra Charles).³²
5. The passages that relate the precedence of Levi over Judah (e.g., *T. Judah* 21, *T. Naphtali* 5) say nothing about two anointed figures or "Messiahs," *when one might most expect it*.
6. The distinction between an ideal eschatological priestly figure and the Messiah in the *Testaments* may reflect nothing more than what may be found elsewhere in Judaism.³³

3. Reenter the Damascus Document (CD)

After a brief detour I return to the four CD references cited above. It should be recalled that the singular *māšīah* originally posed a stumbling-block to adherents of the "two-Messiah" view. But this hardly stopped them. On the basis of the *Testaments* and other "parallel" evidence, a facile theory of medieval scribal emendation was proposed for the four CD readings.

A generation earlier the dispute over the messianism of the scrolls had its counterpart in the debate over the so-called "Zadokite Document," as Solomon Schechter had called it, in which three of the four references found in CD were preserved. These were noticed and commented upon by those who had an axe to grind in the matter.³⁴ Those arguing for the "two-Messiah idea" took comfort in the fact that in one of the CD passages (CD 9b:29 [20:1]) the preposition "from" is used *twice*—"from Aaron and from Israel." Therefore (so those favoring the proposed medieval emendation claimed) the singular

32. R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1913) 2.294.

33. I owe these points largely to LaSor, *Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Faith*, 356; and C. T. Fritsch, "The So-Called 'Priestly Messiah' of the Essenes," *JEOL* 16-19 (1967) 246.

34. According to Silberman, Aptovitzer maintained that the reference was to a single Messiah descended from both Levi and Judah, while Ginzberg held to two separate personages (cf. Silberman, "The Two 'Messiahs,'" 77).

māšīah "represents a later correction of an original *mšyhy* arising from a medieval failure to understand the sect's anticipation of two Messiahs."³⁵ But here we encounter one of those embarrassments that from time to time accompanies new publications of a Scrolls text. Milik subsequently was forced to admit that "new evidence [4QDb, dated 75-50 BCE]—one of the oldest fragments of CD—makes unacceptable my suggestion that the Cairo reading is a late medieval correction."³⁶ The reading is clearly in the singular. On this LaSor correctly commented, 'All of the passages in the Damascus Document are affected . . . if one is not emended, the theory that all had been emended falls to the ground."³⁷

What then could "*māšīah* of Aaron and Israel" in the CD references mean?³⁸ As far back as 1952, Rowley had suggested that *the Qumran sect itself* is Aaron and Israel, with the title "Messiah" referring, not to Messiah's personal descent, but to the character of the community itself. "The Messiah who shall arise from Aaron and Israel is the Messiah who shall arise from the sect."³⁹

It is strange that Rowley's suggestion continues to lie fallow among Qumran specialists. Why? One explanation is that Rowley did

35. Brown, "J. Starcky's Theory," 54 n. 6. Both MSS of CD date from the tenth to the twelfth centuries. For the same view of medieval emendation, cf. Liver, "Doctrine of the Two Messiahs," 152, Kuhn, "Two Messiahs," 59, and J. T. Milik, *Verbum Domini* 30 (1952) 39-40. In an earlier study ("Die Beiden Messias, Aaron and Israels," *NTS* 1 [1955] 174), Kuhn conjectured the presence of a similar substitution in CD 8:2 (6:1), which contains the phrase (so Charles) "through Moses and also through his holy anointed one." *Bmsyhy*, however, was misread as *bmsyhw*, claimed Kuhn, and should be read "through the holy anointed ones." M. Borrows agreed (*The Dead Sea Scrolls* [New York: Viking, 1955] 353). Such a view, however, flies in the face of Morton Smith's legitimate warning ("What is implied," 67) that a similar phrase in the War Scroll (1QM 11:7), "your messiahs" is probably referring to the OT prophets. The Zadokite fragments themselves, in fact, contain another such reference (CD 2:12), where *mšyhy* is used for "those anointed by His Holy Spirit" (Smith, *ibid.*, 67 n. 9). Thus, says Smith, "there are a number of passages where the word 'messiah' does appear, but refers to some anointed functionary who may have nothing whatever to do with the End, and in any case owes his title to a position quite other than that normally, in modern usage, called messianic."

36. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery*, 125 n. 3. This material was available in 1956, about the same time the articles of Kuhn and Brown were published. Clearly there is some justification for the lament of Qumran specialists that their writings have been obsolete before the ink is dry on the pages.

37. Lasor, *Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Faith*, 355.

38. I cannot here deal with all the suggestions that have been made regarding the meaning of the phrase. Talmon ("Concepts of *māšīah*," 105 n. 64) suggests that the CD references display a distributive singular construct form. On this, cf. Abegg, "Seeing Double," 129-30.

39. H. H. Rowley, *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1952) 41.

not go far enough. Could the Qumran Literature references mean the Messiah of *all* Israel?⁴⁰ Fritsch took the term precisely in Rowley's sense, citing among several passages, 1QM 3:13. There the great banner at the head of the whole people displays the phrase "people of God" and the names "Israel" and "Aaron." "The Messiah of Aaron and Israel" of CD, furthermore, could in fact be the "Prince" of CD 7:18-20. In all five cases the figure concerned is the agent of God who deals with the ungodly. But the only one who actually wields "the sword" is the Messiah of Israel.⁴¹

Supporting this are two additional pieces of evidence: (1) In the *War Scroll* the priest does not directly participate in the battle.⁴² (2) In CD 14:19 the *māšīaḥ* of Aaron and Israel will "pardon iniquities." The term used for "pardoning iniquity" in CD is *kpr* ("atone for, expiate") the identical verb applied to God in 1QS 2:8, 11:14 and CD 2:5, 3:18, 4:6, 9, 10. Elsewhere in the scrolls the term *kpr* is predicated of *the community* (1QS 5:6, 8:6, 10, 9:4; 1QM 2:5, 1QSa 1:3). In the phrase "Messiah of Aaron and Israel," therefore, we may see the expiatory role of the community, a role that devolves upon its figurehead, the Messiah.⁴³

It is this context—that of expiating and redeeming—that might call to mind Klausner's well-known description of postbiblical Jewish messianic thought:

The Messiah must be *both* king and redeemer. He must overthrow the enemies of Israel, establish the kingdom of Israel, and rebuild the temple; and at the same time he must . . . root out idolatry from the world, proclaim the one and only God to all, *put an end to sin*, and be wise, pious and just as no man had been before him or ever be after him. In short, he is the great political *and spiritual hero* at one and the same time.⁴⁴

Those who advocate the two-Messiah approach, on the other hand, may disagree with this characterization as a description of the thought of the community. For them the Messiah of Israel will be a purely "political" figure. Any interpretation of OT texts⁴⁵ at Qumran which might ostensibly point to the contrary will be automatically filtered

40. Bruce Vawter, "Levitical Messianism and the New Testament," in *The Bible in Current Catholic Thought* (ed. J. L. McKenzie; New York: Herder & Herder, 1962) 95 (italics mine).

41. Fritsch, "The 'priestly Messiah,'" 242 n. 2; and R. B. Laurin, "The Problem of Two Messiahs in the Qumran Scrolls," *RevQ* 4 (1963) 49-51.

42. Cf. H. Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963) 179. f13. E. A. Wcela, "The Messiah(s) of Qumran," *CBQ* 26 (1964) 341.

44. J. Klausner, *The Messianic Idea in Israel* (New York: Macmillan, 1955) 392 (italics mine). For a similar approach, cf. W. F. Stinespring, "Eschatology in Chronicles," *JBL* 80 (1961) 215.

45. Cf., e.g., Num 24:17, the oracle of Balaam: "A star shall come forth out of Jacob, / and a scepter shall rise out of Israel." While originally the two figures referred to the same person (so F. F. Bruce, *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964] 85), at Qumran the two figures are disassociated and "the synonymous

out or transferred to the priestly messiah.⁴⁶ This reasoning, of course, rests on the very thesis to be proven—that of two "Messiahs."

All of the above evidence would seem to support the general conclusion that the CD texts, "in conjunction with the singular referents from the *Testaments*, would appear to argue for the existence of a singular messianic expectation in Second Temple theology before the advent of Christianity."⁴⁷

4. *The Manual of Discipline (IQS)*

Many Qumran scholars believed that proof of "two Messiahs" was finally provided when the text of IQS, the *Manual of Discipline*, was finally published. There 9:11 contained the much longed-for plural *māšīahê*. The passage may be quoted in full:

When these things come to pass in Israel (9:3). . . . They shall not depart from any counsel of the Law, walking in all the stubbornness of their hearts; but they shall judge by the first judgments by which the men of the community began to be disciplined, until there shall come a prophet and the Messiahs [*māšīahê*] of Aaron and Israel (9-11).⁴⁸

Because the plural form *māšīahê* is unique, it was immediately subjected to the most rigorous scrutiny. M. Delcor, M. Black and Laurin,⁴⁹ for instance, were all unsuccessful in their attempts to emend it to the singular. It is now generally felt that the passage is fortified against any "grammatical and syntactical maneuvering."⁵⁰ Perhaps the only genuine note of caution was supplied by Milik, a "two-Messiah"

parallelism ignored" (W H. Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible* [New York: Oxford University Press 1964] 100-101). In The Zadokite Admonition 7:19-20 and 1 QM 11:6, the "star" is the "expounder of the law," while the "scepter" is the "prince of all the congregation." "Scepter" and "prince" are royal designations that no doubt look back to Ezek 34:24, 37:25, etc., and refer to the conquering Messiah who will bring in the close of the age.

46. Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran*, 182.

47. Abegg, "Seeing Double," 130-31.

48. Kuhn's translation ("*The Two Messiahs*," 281 n. 86).

49. M. Delcor, "L'eschatologie des documents de Khirbet Qumran," *RSR* 26 (1952) 367-68; M. Black, "Theological Conceptions in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *SEA* 18-19 (1953-54) 85-92; Laurin, "Problem of Two Messiahs," 51.

50. Fritsch, "The 'Priestly Messiah,'" 244. Burrows makes an honest attempt to exhaust every other possible reading of the phrase but judges them all to be "impossible" ("The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," *ATR* 34 [1952] 203-4). Wcela argues that we must learn from our experience with the CD readings and curb any impulse to emend the passage. After all, he points out, IQS went through several editions, and it is "unlikely that an editor would allow such an important variation as a plural 'messiahs' to go uncorrected" (Wcela, "The Messiah(s) of Qumran," 342). The most recent attempt to emend to the singular is that of M. O. Wise and James D. Tabor ("The Messiah at Qumran," *BAR* 18 [1992] 60-61), who claim that one of the Cave 4 copies lacks the line. But see Abegg, "Seeing Double," 131.

proponent himself, who observed that the expression does not occur in the oldest exemplar of 1QS: 4QSe breaks off after 8:16 and only resumes at 9:12.⁵¹

Thus supplied with the necessary "jot" on which to build their case, those scholars who already saw a plural messianism in the scrolls lost little time in making the most of the serendipitous reading. Kuhn claimed that final proof of medieval tampering with CD had finally been supplied by 1QS.⁵² It was even suggested by Burrows and Milik that we now have at Qumran *three* "messianic" figures, a prophet and the two Messiahs.⁵³ They rejected the supposition of Brownlee that the passage indicates that the prophet was the Messiah, and that the two "anointed ones" were his followers.⁵⁴ "This involves," says Burrows, "the decidedly precarious assumption that the Messiah is one who is not so designated, while those who actually are so designated are only his followers."⁵⁵ So, adds Milik, the plural messiahship implied by the term *mešīahê* of Aaron and Israel is "grammatically . . . *the only possible interpretation.*"⁵⁶

Reading the work of most recent Qumran scholars might lead one to the view that 1QS 9:11 "has established the two messiah the-

51. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery*, 123, and LaSor, *Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Faith*, 354. Here the comment of L. H. Schiffman is worth recording: ". . . there may or may not have been a two-Messiah concept in the original text of the Rule of the Community" ("Messianic Figures and Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Messiah* [ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992] 120. Abegg, on the other hand ("Seeing Double," 131), responding to Wise and Tabor, thinks it likely that "rather than confirming any manuscript tradition, it appears more likely that the scribe . . . skipped over an entire column of material."

52. Kuhn, "The Two Messiahs," 59-60.

53. M. Burrows, "The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," *ATR* (1952) 204; Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery*, 124; Kuhn, *NTS* 1 (1955) 178; and Milik, "Manualae Disciplinae," *VD* 29 (1951) 152.

54. W. H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline* (BASORSS 10-12; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951) 34-35 n. 19.

55. Burrows, "The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," 204. Here, of course, one might raise an obvious objection: if for Burrows the act of making a Messiah out of one not actually so designated is a "decidedly precarious assumption," with what justification can he postulate a "Messiah of Aaron," since no such designation—by itself—has yet been found in all of Qumran literature? Liver ("Doctrine of the Two Messiahs," 154) claimed that just such a designation had been found, but failed to document this claim (cf. LaSor, *Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Faith*, 356, and Fritsch, "The 'Priestly Messiah,'" 245). Brownlee, not to be deterred, admits that the title is missing (*Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible*, 98 n. 81) but claims "it is implicit in [1QS 9:11]. Even if this nomenclature was never used at all in the singular, it becomes a helpful terminology for us—just as the word Messiah gives us a useful term in discussing certain OT prophecies at a time prior to its technical usage." But this is hardly a helpful analogy: the "messianic" nature of the said OT prophecies are probably as murky as those at Qumran.

56. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery*, 124 (italics mine). Cf. also Brown, "J. Starcky's Theory," 55.

ory as dogma."⁵⁷ On the basis of the tendentious readings of CD "and the one sure passage from the Community Rule, most Qumran scholars began to read all messianic texts expecting to find two messiahs."⁵⁸ But against seeing a multiple messiahship in 1QS 9:11 there has been arrayed over the past thirty years a formidable group of Qumran specialists. These include Vawter, Silberman, Higgins, Black, Fritsch, Abegg, and Wise. Vawter,⁵⁹ for example, proposes (although somewhat dubiously) that the plural *māšīaḥ* has a *double* meaning: "'Messiah of Israel' is a technical term for 'the Messiah,' while 'Messiah of Aaron'⁶⁰ is the conventional high-priestly designation for an individual eschatological priest of the priestly line." Another alternative to the two-Messiah idea is the translation proposed separately by Higgins and Fritsch: "the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel."⁶¹ In this case, quite simply, the Davidic Messiah and his accompanying priest are meant (with the commissioning of the priest reflecting such biblical passages as Lev 4:3, 5, 16, where the phrase *hakkōhēn hamašīaḥ*—found also in the Qumran literature⁶²—has nothing to do with what we usually mean by *messiahship*.⁶³

57. Abegg, "Seeing Double," 131.

58. *Ibid.*, 132.

59. Vawter, "Levitical Messianism," 94. Liver, to the contrary, claims that the phrase "'Anointed ones of Aaron and Israel' is an avoidance of a reference to the Davidic king" ("Doctrine of the two Messiahs," 159). Wcela, attacking from another angle, opposes Vawter's proposal of a double meaning on the basis of parallel constructions in 1QS 3:18, "the spirits of truth and falsehood," and 3:25, "the spirits of darkness and light," which have been established "in equal measure" ("The Messiah(s) of Qumran," 425). Hence, claims Wcela, the two spirits "tied together in this construction are alike not just in title, but also in level of existence. Would this not be an indication that the construction and terminology of 'Messiahs of Aaron and Israel' implies the same type of equality?" Accordingly, he concludes, if we identify "the Messiah of Israel" in 9:11 as the Davidic lay figure (as almost all do), we are bound to consider the Messiah of Aaron on the same level, that is, as a "true Messiah" (pp. 342–43).

60. In using this term, of course, Vawter is equally liable to the above criticism aimed at Burrows.

61. So Higgins, "Priest and Messiah," 332; grid Fritsch, "The 'Priestly Messiah,'" 244–45.

62. According to Milik (*Ten Years of Discovery*, 126), Strugnell showed him a text from Cave 4 that contained the phrase. Brown ("J. Starcky's Theory," 56 n 18) denies the existence of the title in Qumran literature.

63. This is to be preferred to the view of LaSor ("The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," *VT* 6 [1956] 428; and "The Messianic Idea in Qumran," in *Studies and Essays in Honor of Abraham A. Neuman* [ed. Meir Ben-Horin et al.; Leiden: Brill for the Dropsie College, Philadelphia, 1962] 355), who claimed that 1QS 9:11 should be seen, as with the CD references, as describing a single individual, "the Messiah of Aaron" and "the Messiah of Israel." Burrows (*More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* [New York: Viking, 1958] 299) opposed this by adducing the phrase "the spirits of truth and falsehood" as a parallel syntactical construction that cannot be taken as a unity. LaSor ("Messianic Idea," 355), not to be deterred, counterproposed "knowers of good and evil," Gen 3:5,

5. *The Rule of the Congregation (IQSa)*

Another text to which appeal continues to be made in support of the "two-Messiah" hypothesis (and indeed of the precedence of "the Messiah of Aaron" over the "Davidic Messiah") is the description of "the Messianic Banquet" in the document of two columns (the lost beginning of 1QS?⁶⁴), 1QSa. In *Serek ha'edah* (or, more fully, *The Rule of the Congregation of Israel at the End of Time* [wzh hsrk lkwl 'dh ysr' l b' hrt hymym])⁶⁵ is found the famous passage that may speak of God "begetting" the Messiah.⁶⁶

Here again, so it is claimed, a levitical domination of the messianic concept is to be seen, insofar as the priest precedes the Davidic figure at the banquet.⁶⁷ But does the evidence support the claim? How, for instance, would the subordination have originated? It has been suggested that the Qumran sect grew out of the "extreme pietists" of Judaism, the Hasidim⁶⁸ and that after a break with the synagogue in Jerusalem⁶⁹ these "Temple priests" settled by the Dead Sea. Naturally, therefore, the Messiah to come, of the line of Aaron, would be one of them and would come before the royal messianic figure of David.⁷⁰ "In circles where a quietistic priestly emphasis was strong, the Levitical character of the Messiah dominated (e.g., Qum-

and "men of blood and deceit," Ps 5:7. But LaSor admits that the Qumran syntax may be different from that of Biblical Hebrew, weakening his parallels.

64. Kuhn, however, rejects this view. While at first the columns appeared to be the lost beginning, "later they were rightly recognized as an independent text" (Kuhn, "The Two Messiahs," 54). Milik, however, writing in 1957 (*Ten Years of Discovery*, 124), refers to the columns as "the same scribe's copy of one of the appendices to the Rule." Cf. also D. Barthelemy and J. T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), in which Barthelemy translated 1QSa (no. 28a) and Milik 1QSB (no. 28, *The Benedictions*), 107-30. Brown ("J. Starcky's Theory," 55) also refers to 1QSa and 1QSB as "both parts of the original IQS scroll," as does G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Heritage, 1962) 99. Such a connection might strengthen the case for a plurality of Messiahs in 1QS 9:11, but it is merely on the basis of cumulative weight.

65. Vermes (ibid.) renamed it *The Messianic Rule*.

66. English reconstruction that of Florentino Garcia Martinez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* (2d Eng. ed.; trans. W. G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) 127-28.

67. Here "priest" (in the phrase "[the] chief [priest]") has been supplied conjecturally on the basis of the context here and in 1:19. Cf. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1958) 88 n. 70, and his review of *Qumran Cave I* in *JBL* 75 (1956) 121-25.

68. Cf. Liver, "The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs," 81.

69. Brownlee (*The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible*, 102) suggests that the first stanza of Joshua's curse in 4QTestimonia is borrowed from Josh 6:26, where its omission of the reference to Jericho agrees with the LXX. "This reading may have made possible a transfer of the bearing of the curse from Jericho to Jerusalem."

70. Cf. B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and in the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965) 14-15.

ran). Where Pharisaic influence was felt, legal and prophetic elements were stressed (e.g., Assump. Moses 9f., 4 Ezra 14)."⁷¹

But again, such an assumption is at best tentative. In 1QSa the crucial phrase "Messiah of Aaron" is not used for the priest—in *a context where one would most expect it*.⁷² This should suggest that there is some danger in making such claims. But there may be another, more glaring, warning signal. May we be sure that the priest of 1QSa is an "eschatological" figure, in *any* sense of that much-debated term? The phrase "the last days" might, of course, lead us precisely in this direction. But apart from the ambiguity of the same phrase in the NT writings, the possibility exists that the Qumran sect felt that they were living *on the verge* of the great battle.

What is meant by "on the verge of," of course, remains pivotal. The messianic meal (at least in theory) could have been the common meal of the community, "here and now, with its *de facto* head the priest, when the Messiah makes himself present. Thus [the priest] is hardly messianic."⁷³ While it may be claimed, in addition, that the priest takes precedence over the lay figure in 1QSa, such an arrangement would be normal fare for any typical Second Temple community and may have little or nothing to do with what is often spoken of as "messiahship." Naturally the priest would *precede* any political figure, no matter how exalted or ideal, in a state/religious celebration.⁷⁴ According to M. G. Abegg, "the diners would be . . . waiting

71. Longenecker, *Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*, 65.

72. Laurin, "Problem of Two Messiahs," 49-51.

73. Vawter, "Levitical Messianism," 94-95 (italics mine). M. Black (in *Studia Patristica* [ed. K. Aland and F. M. Cross; Berlin: Akademie, 1957] 1.441ff.) agrees, as does Brown ("J. Starcky's Theory," 61), for whom the banquet in 1QSa was liturgically celebrated with readiness, "in case God should bring forth the Messiah with them." But M. Smith ("God's Begetting of the Messiah" in 1QSa," *NTS* 5 [1959-60]) goes too far in *NTS* 5 in taking the other extreme and denying the presence of the Messiah of Israel in the passage. "The 'anointed of Israel' . . . is only a priest 'anointed for war; 'the leader of the fighting force.' There is certainly reason to hesitate before assuming that the assemblies discussed . . . are eschatological, or that either of its anointed ones is a messianic figure" (p. 224). J. F. Priest, ("The Messiah and the Meal in 1QSa," *JBL* 82 [1963] 98-100, suggests a moderate position, namely that the sect, as a priestly community, was projecting its high priest into the messianic age; "of Israel" was added to "the Messiah" in order to distinguish him from the priest, "who is growing in importance." Thus the "seed" of the two-Messiah doctrine is demonstrated in 1QSa but not manifested until 1QS 9:11. (This view, of course, may run into serious difficulty if it is established that both texts were originally part of the same scroll.) Cf. also Priest's *The Two Messiahs at Qumran* (Ph.D. dissertation, Drew University, 1960) 262-65; and "The Messiah and the Meal in 1QSa," *JBL* 82 (1963) 95-100, where he maintains that the messianic status of the priest in most of the documents in which he is found are possibly the result of the passage of time and of theological development within the sect.

74. Cf., for example, M. Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (London: Nelson, 1961) 147; and Fritsch, "The 'Priestly Messiah,'" 245. Here one might draw an analogy from more recent history. At the coronation of Elizabeth II in 1952, the Archbishop of

expectantly for the arrival of the messiah of Israel, and when the priest appears in line 19 it is to bless the firstfruits of the bread and wine, whereupon the messiah partakes, followed by the people."⁷⁵

6. The Benedictions (*IQSb*)

What may be true of *IQSa* will probably be all the more certain for a short section of *IQSb*, *The Benedictions*, a fragmentary text composed of five out of six original columns.⁷⁶ There is considerable uncertainty regarding the order of the columns and, since it may be ultimately impossible to arrive at the correct order of the fragments within each column, the question has been raised as to whether the right blessings and groups have been matched.⁷⁷ The most common assumption is that the groups of *IQSa* are being blessed and that we would then have blessings for the community, the priest, the lesser priestly functionaries, and finally the Messiah of Israel (who is termed "the Prince of the Congregation").⁷⁸ The blessing for the priest actually lacks the name "priest" (although in fairness it needs to be said that the context suggests it).⁷⁹

The blessing for the Prince, on the other hand, makes it clear that he is the Davidic Messiah.⁸⁰ He devastates the earth with his breath, kills the wicked, stamps on them like mud, and so forth. But even if the customary order of precedence of *IQSa* is granted, the same principle at work in *IQSa* (where in normal Second Temple Jewish practice the priest takes precedence) should once again be applicable: the priestly figure takes precedence over the secular figure, not as a sign of precedence, but as an indication of ritual.

Canterbury, Michael Ramsey, preceded Princess Elizabeth into Westminster Abbey. Did this mean that Archbishop Ramsey (or the Church of England, whom he represented) was "taking precedence over" or "dominating" the crown of England? That the majority of scrolls scholars from 1948 to the present have been almost entirely American or Israeli, that is, they represent highly evolved democracies, has perhaps not served the study of the scrolls well in this particular instance.

75. Abegg, "Seeing Double," 132.

76. For a brief but helpful analysis of the text, cf. *ibid.*, 135-36.

77. Milik, *Qumran Cave I*, 119. See most recently the unpublished paper of M. G. Abegg (which as a courtesy he has shared with me), "IQSb 3:1-21: A Blessing on the Messiah of Aaron or a Presupposition in Search of Support?" delivered at the 1996 SBL meeting at New Orleans.

78. *IQM* 5:20 and *CD* 7:20 contain the same term. The latter is the oracle of Balaam discussed above.

79. Fritsch, on the other hand, is hesitant.

80. Cf. the cogent argument of Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran*, 181. Milik (*Qumran Cave I*, 129) finds allusions in the blessing to Isa 11:1-5, Num 24:17, and Gen 49:8-10, all interpreted messianically at Qumran.

7. *The War Scroll (1QM)*

Another text already mentioned is the *War Scroll*, 1QM. Here it has to be admitted that the figure who plays the leading role is the priest⁸¹ (*kwhn hrwš*) who organizes the battle plans against the ungodly forces of Belial. Conspicuous by his absence in the battle is the "Messiah of Israel," although the text is incomplete, and it is possible that reference to him has been lost. "The Prince of the Congregation" bears such epithets as "Israel, Levi, and Aaron" on his shield (5:1): but no description of his part in the battle is given.

Some, on the other hand, have claimed to find him in the hymn of the *gibbor* (12:10-15) who crushes his enemies.⁸² But others see the reference to God,⁸³ with no mention in 1QM of the Messiah of Israel.⁸⁴

And yet, the incomplete nature of 1QM, together with the Semitic habit of stressing functions over persons, should cause some hesitation in being too confident in our assumptions about what kind of situation is reflected in 1QM.⁸⁵

At this point the correct attitude may be summarized by Wcela, himself an advocate of the two-Messiah hypothesis: "Many authors see in these texts a consistent series of references to two Messiahs, one priestly and one lay. However, *none of the texts, taken individually, or even cumulatively, establishes beyond doubt the messianic status of the priest.*"⁸⁶

IV. OTHER TEXTS

The messianic status of the other figure, the Davidic "Messiah," may be more easily demonstrated from other texts. In addition to his

81. Here I resist the term eschatological for reasons that may become apparent in a forthcoming publication.

82. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis*, 46; and Milik, *Qumran Cave 1*, 121.

83. Brown, "J. Starcky's Theory," 58. J. Carmignac (*La regle de la guerre* [Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1958]) agrees (I owe this quote to Wcela, "The Messiah(s) of Qumran," 345).

84. Brown, it appears, rejects the "Prince" as Messianic. Why he does so is not stated ("J. Starcky's Theory").

85. Ibid., 59. Chaim Rabin, in *Qumran Studies: Scripta Judaica* ([London: Oxford University Press, 1957] 118), on the other hand, provides an interesting parallel from Islamic literature. "The generic Muslim name for Messianic events is *milhamah*, 'war', but in Rabbinic parlance these events are called *hevle hammashiach*, 'birth pangs of the Messiah', and the only place, to my knowledge, where *milhamah* occurs in this sense is in a report about the finding of an old messianic scroll. . . . In 1QM the word occurs in the messianic sense in the title and again in the 'epochs' of the wars of thy hands." Of course the parallel is drawn more sharply with the Davidic figure than with this sacerdotal counterpart, even though he never actually takes part in the battle.

86. Wcela, "The Messiah(s) of Qumran," 347 (italics mine).

various titles—"the Scepter" and "Prince"⁸⁷ (1QSb, Zadokite Admonition, 1QM), "the Messiah" (1QSa 2:11-12), "the Messiah of Israel" (1QSa 2:14, 20)—he is extolled in several texts published in 1956 by Allegro.⁸⁸ These indicate that the expectation of the future ruler is clearly the Davidic figure of OT expectation.

Of special interest to our subject is one of the fragments from a peshar on Genesis 49 (christened by Allegro 4QPatriarchal Blessings) which mentions "the Messiah of Righteousness,"⁸⁹ *māšīah haššedeq*, as an equation of the enigmatic "Shiloh" of Gen 49:10⁹⁰ and "the shoot of David," *šemaḥ dāwid* (cf. Jer 23:5; 33:15; Zech 3:8; 6:12). The latter term is found in at least two other texts from Cave 4: 4QFlorilegium (4QFlor), a collection of messianic expectations based on an exegesis of biblical texts that deals with the oracle of Nathan in 2 Sam 7:11-14, and a fragment of a peshar on Isa 11:1-5, termed 4QpIsa frg. D. In the first two of these fragments, moreover, the "Shoot of David" is mentioned as arising along with a mysterious "interpreter of the law." No mention, however, has been found among these fragments of a priestly companion of the "shoot of David."⁹¹ Such texts clearly need to be brought into the discussion of "the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel."⁹²

4QTestimonia, a florilegium of quotations copied about 100 BCE that is almost intact, may be a surviving form of the "Testimonia type" of document that was postulated earlier this century by A. Rendel Harris to have been the basis of the NT Kerygma.⁹³ 4QTestimonia comprises four texts: the prediction of a "prophet like Moses" (Deut 18:18), Balaam's oracle (Num 24:15-17), Jacob's blessing of Levi (Deut 33:8-11), and a passage from the pseudepigraphic *Psalms of Joshua*. Some (e.g., Bruce)⁹⁴ have seen in these four texts the three figures of 1QS 9:11: the prophet, the "Star" or priestly "Messiah," and the "Scepter" or Davidic Messiah, together with a general reference to the levitical priesthood. But Allegro⁹⁵ felt, probably rightly, that the first three

87. In Brown's view this term, on the other hand, may have indicated a regular office of leadership at Qumran with no special messianic significance attached ("J. Starcky's Theory").

88. J. M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," *JBL* 75 (1956) 174-87.

89. Or "the legitimate Messiah."

90. S. Mowinckel (*He That Cometh* [trans. G. W. Anderson; Nashville: Abingdon, 1954] 13 n. 2) claims that "Shiloh" is a poetical term borrowed from the Akkadian for "his ruler."

91. Unless one sees him in the figure termed "a priest of high rank."

92. Liver, "The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs," 159.

93. Cf. A. Rendel Harris, *Testimonia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920).

94. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis*, 110.

95. Allegro, "Further Messianic References," 187.

refer to the three functions of the Messiah(s)—the prophet, priestly, and kingly. The unifying theme throughout all four passages, in other words, may not be *messiahship*, but the destruction of the enemies of "the Star."⁹⁶

Other texts of interest to the question of the "anointed ones" at Qumran continue to surface and be discussed. These include 4QPa-triarchal Blessings, 4Q161 (*Pesher Isaiah*), 4Q246 (the *Son of God* text), 4Q285 (the *War Rule*, probably the final section of the incomplete *War Scroll*), 4Q375 and 4Q376 (*Moses-Pseudepigrapha*), 4Q377 (*Apocryphal Moses C*), 4Q458 (*Narrative*), 4Q521 (*Psalm on the Resurrection*), and 4Q377 2 ii 5 (which speaks of Moses as "God's anointed"). Space does not allow here an appropriate discussion of these texts.⁹⁷

V. A "DIARCHY" OF KING AND PRIEST?

Turning to the evidence of the OT itself, the relevance of the situation under Joshua and Zerubbabel for the question of multiple "messiahs" at Qumran is of critical importance. At the least such parallels lend weight to the proposition that there was nothing unique about the Qumran sect's messianic expectation. The Qumran community held to a pairing of priest and king that may also be found in the period of Jewish history during the tenure of Joshua and Zerubbabel. In this context the following points should be made:

1. In Zech 4:14 the priest Joshua and the king Zerubbabel are described as "the *two sons of oil*."⁹⁸ Here "two sons of oil" clearly indicates "the two 'anointed ones.'" This may ultimately have enormous implications for the interpretation of 1QS 9:11.
2. In the (undoubtedly) corrupt text of Zech 6:11-13, *two* crowns are placed on the head of the Jewish king, Joshua. Why *two*? Some have suggested a textual corruption. This is of course possible, but the most likely explanation is that "two crowns" is original. One

96. Ibid. "Thus the whole collection is not so much 'messianic' as eschatological."

97. For a helpful survey, cf. Abegg, "Seeing Double," 132ff.

98. "Two sons of oil," claims Brownlee (*Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible*, 99), "is a literal expression which is correctly translated in the Bible as 'the two anointed'; but it does not give us verbal agreement with the language of the Manual of Discipline . . . even this minor discrepancy is bridged by the statement of 1 Chron. 29:22, 'They anointed him (Solomon) as Prince for the Lord, and Zadok as Priest.'" Here the anointed stand side by side as representatives of state and "church." See also Ezekiel 40-48, the program for the new commonwealth, where apparently the Prince is subordinate to the priests, although the latter are by no means seen as "Messiahs" (42:13ff.).

crown is to be placed on the head of Zerubbabel, the other upon Joshua.⁹⁹

3. The same idea survived within the apocalyptic tradition. In Rev 11:4 the "two witnesses" are "the two olive trees" (cf. Zech 4:3-13) and "the two sons of oil" (a clear allusion to Zech 4:14). That for John of Patmos these descriptions embodied what were then understood as "orthodox" roles—the normal kingly and priestly functions, while now democratized to represent the whole martyred church—is indicated by Rev 1:6, "who has appointed us *a kingdom, priests to his God and Father.*" Here the combination of "kingdom" and "priests" in the most apocalyptic document in the NT, considered by some to be similar in thought to the Qumran literature, has been strangely ignored by those who argue for an exceptional "diarchy" in the scrolls.
4. In 1 Sam 2:35 the rejection of the family of Eli led to the prophecy that a new, faithful priest will be appointed, the family of whom will "serve in perpetual succession before my anointed king." In 1 Kgs 2:27 this individual is identified as Zadok, to whom the Qumran community traced its heritage, while in CD 3:18-19 the Samuel oracle is seen as a prophecy of the Qumran sect. The "faithful priest" and "the anointed one," consequently, are the historical antecedents of the two figures at Qumran who are termed *māšīahē* (although the former is distinguished in 1 Samuel from "my anointed"). The priest also "walks before" (has precedence over?) the anointed king. But, it needs to be asked, does such precedence indicate that the priest is a "Messiah"?¹⁰⁰

A similar situation, the pairing of an ideal king and priest, prevailed in the early second century with the rise of Simeon bar Kochba, "the Star," who issued coins with himself and "Eleazar the Priest" on opposite sides.¹⁰¹ Here is a clear carrying through of the biblical and apocalyptic pattern that prevailed throughout Second Temple history, a pattern that, if what I have suggested above is correct, predominated at Qumran as well. The idea of a "diarchy" that predominated during a special time in Jewish history (that which pertained under Joshua and

99. Cf. Schubert (*Dead Sea Community*), who traces Qumran's "two-Messiah doctrine" to this passage, claiming that it "is in unusual degree both pro-Zadokite and pro-Davidic." But, remarks Brownlee, Schubert's zeal has caused him to overlook the apparent textual suppression of Zerubbabel (see Brownlee's review of Schubert, *JBL* 80 [1961] 278-79; and Brown, "Messianism," 63 n. 53). This suppression almost certainly resulted from a Hasmonean interest in claiming that the royal succession devolved upon the priestly figure.

100. Fritsch, "The 'Priestly Messiah,'" 244.

101. Cf. A. Reifenberg, *Ancient Jewish Coins* (Jerusalem: R. Mass, 1947), table 13, no. 169, for a plate of the Bar Kochba coin.

Zerubbabel) and with which we may compare the Qumran community, is an ill-founded concept that needs to be viewed with suspicion.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

I now summarize my conclusions:

1. The common decision to adopt the English "Messiah" wherever *māšîah* occurs in Qumran literature, together with the act of capitalizing it, is suspect and tendentious. While not exactly a "linguistic crime," it begs the question to be asked: what significance do these figures in the Qumran texts have?
2. Qumran literature contains numerous references to a lay "Messiah" or an "anointed one" who conforms to the OT pattern of an ideal, royal, Davidic deliverer. "The Messiah," "the Messiah of Israel," "the Messiah of Righteousness," "the Scepter," "the Shoot of David," "the Prince," and "the Prince of the Congregation" are just a few of the terms by which he is known. His coming signals the beginning of the war of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness (the *kittim*), which in some texts he is to lead. This will mean the beginning of a new era in which he will guide all nations (1QpIsa).
3. When the CD references are weighed with the delicate nuances they deserve (but which they all too infrequently have been given), they yield nothing of the kind of clear evidence for a "multiple messiahship" that has often been assumed for the Qumran materials. "The *māšîah* from Aaron [and from] Israel" may well mean the community from which the Messiah is to spring; or it may be a singular construct ("anointed ones from Aaron [and from] Israel") that points to a traditional pairing of king and priest. No theory of medieval scribal emendation to the singular—from a proposed originally plural *māšîahê*—can be supported by responsible exegesis. Cross-references to the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* may be attempted, but they are complicated by the uncertainty of the history of the text, not to mention the possible presence of Christian interpolations in our extant text of the *Testaments*.
4. The Dead Sea materials contain references to other individuals, including a prophet and a priestly figure who may or may not be a "Messiah." In 1QSa this priestly figure takes precedence over the lay figure; but this may indicate nothing extraordinary for a religious community in which the priesthood played a significant role. It is possible that the prophet is himself a "messianic" figure in 1QS 9:11, in which "the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel" may

indicate either the community that is to accompany the prophet-Messiah or the currently anointed king and priest(s). But since it is uncertain whether or not the prophet is to be a contemporary of the *māšīahê*, it is unlikely that this can be established with certainty. What may be likewise indeterminate is that the *māšīahê* of 1QS 9:11 is justifiable as a cross-reference for the CD references; due to our continuing uncertainty as to how we should translate *māšīahê*, it may be impossible to know whether or not the texts are saying the same things.

5. The idea of a "diarchy" that was exclusive to the time of Joshua and Zerubbabel, and which points the way to enlightenment in understanding the similar views of the Qumran sect, is flawed.
6. The problem of differences of opinion within the sect, together with the possibility of changes over a period of time, further complicate our picture of the Qumran evidence. The constant cross-referencing from one document to another—as if by doing so one can illustrate "the Qumran teaching" on this or that subject—should be received with a scholarly grain of salt.

Despite what we might wish, the cherished notions of one generation of scholars need constantly to be tested by the next generation. To those familiar with the rules of evidence, what we have examined above indicates that the idea at Qumran of two "Messiahs"—a "Messiah of Aaron" and a "Messiah of Israel"—is certainly one of those "cherished notions." Put more forcefully, the belief in "two Messiahs at Qumran," no matter how often it continues to be stated as dogma, should have been seen long ago for what it is: rather than being a deduction from the evidence, it is a creation of modern scholars.