JOSEPHUS AND THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS: The Essenes, Zadok and the Teacher of Righteousness - Possible Connections Revisited

A close look at the first century Jewish historian Flavius Josephus, indicates there is important evidence which could portray the Essenes, the doctrine of the Teacher of Righteousness and other Dead Sea Scrolls sectarian matters in a new military historical framework than has wider implications and connections than has hitherto been generally appreciated. This military framework can be related to Josephus' statement in Antiquities 18.4ff about the three Jewish philosophies and a certain Judas 'appropriating a Zadok Pharisee' to form a fourth philosophy that eventually led to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE. Here a re-examination of what was seen by early modern scholarship as a later scribal error in the ancient Greek text of Josephus Antiquities (18.22) can also be combined

---

1 Steve Mason's "Will the Real Josephus Please Stand Up?" Biblical Archaeology Review 23:5 1997 (Sept/Oct), 58-68 began to give me the courage to speak more seriously about Josephus as a useful historian in an academic context. His willingness to correspond with me afterwards about my ideas and his encouragement to attend (which I was able to do occasionally starting in 2000), the Josephus Section meetings at SBL which he chaired, has been an immense help for this work which I would like to give tribute to here. I am also very grateful to the many other scholars who have helped me along on this journey as well.

2 The Greek of 18.4a is generally seen as a reference to two people, Judas and Sadduc, with the verb participle aorist passive nominative masculine singular from προσλαμβάνω translated as 'taking' rather than 'appropriating': Ἰούδας δὲ Γαυλανίτης ἀνὴρ ἐκ πόλεως ὄνομα Γάμαλα Σάδδωκον Φαρισαίον προσλαμβάνον. However it is important to note that Zadok is an actual textual variant listed by Feldman in the Loeb Edition cited below. Since Zadok was an important sobriquet in the Dead Sea Scrolls literature, could this usage here by Josephus be a related theological moniker used with the seemingly contrary moniker 'Pharisee' in an attempt by Josephus to summarize the contradictions in Judas' fourth philosophy which Josephus then proceeds to describe. This possible interpretation will be discussed further below.

with other important evidence to provide a fresh interpretation of sectarian and various biblical passages which give important new perspectives.  

From the onset it can be stated that Josephus who wrote from a Jewish perspective for a Roman audience in the latter first century is not an easy author to fully understand. As Ralph Marcus noted in his 1934 preface to the Loeb edition of Josephus' *Antiquities* Books 5-8, in expressing his views of the complex problems in even establishing Josephus' original Greek text:

> These difficulties are illustrated by the inconsistent spelling of biblical names of persons and places in the same MS. And the variants in the two families of MSS. No editor may reasonably hope to have established in every case, the forms used by Josephus himself.

The task of fully appreciating the original ancient meanings, not to mention the actual history behind Josephus' account, is made even more challenging by the common use of the many nicknames and sobriquets in first century Jewish culture. Far too often names, persons and places found in translations of Josephus are used based simply on text of translations without regard to the possibility of deeper understandings related to the underlying problems and at times the quite complex situations which underlie the original text(s). Thus at the time of the death of king Herod (4 BCE) and the census of Quirinius (6 CE), instead of considering, for instance, the name Zadok, mentioned by Josephus in *Antiquities* 18 (and often seen as a person contemporary to Judas), it is important to consider whether the biblical Zadok and lineage-associated theology rather than an actual reference

---

4 Emended in the sixteenth century and used by translators from William Whiston in the eighteenth century to Louis H. Feldman who in the 1965 Loeb edition unfortunately interpreted Dupont-Sommer's suggestion of emending Δακών to Σαδώκ from the 1950s that the Greek found in all the original codices (τοις πλείστοις) was possibly intended as a reference to "the Many", in Hebrew haravim (הרמים) a sectarian sobriquet used in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Cf. Louis H. Feldman, *Josephus*, vol. IX, Jewish Antiquities, Books XVIII-XIX, (Harvard University Press, 1965, 1981 ed.), n.a, pp. 20f. A. Dupont-Sommer, “On a Passage of Josephus Relating to the Essenes” (Antiq. Xviii.22)” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 1 (1956), pp. 361-366. This revision will be discussed further below. As noted long ago by Théodore Reinach, *Oeuvres complètes de Flavius Josèphe, Tome premier Antiquités Judaïques, Livres I-V* Traduction de Julien Weill (Paris: Ernest Leroux, Éditeur, 1900), p. vii, " Une traduction complète de Josèphe est une oeuvre difficile et de longue haleine. L'auteur, qui apprit le grec tard et assez imparfaitement, écrit d'une phrase, longue et lourde, chargée d'incises, de redites, d'ornements vulgaires, souvent peu claire et mal construite, n'est pas toujours aisé à comprendre et est toujours malaisée à rendre. Que de fois un traducteur consciencieux doit sacrifier l'élégance à la fidélité! Nous nous sommes efforcé du moins de n'y jamais sacrifier la clarté".


6 Tal Ilan, *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity – Part I Palestine 330 BCE – 200 CE* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002). Ilan argues (p. 46) that since the ‘pool of personal names’ used during this period was fairly small, “Inventing nicknames solved the problem.” However this together with challenges faced by scribes over the past two millenium makes for a need for caution on the part of the modern interpreter.
here to possibly contemporary person(s) other than Judas himself who possibly chose to associate himself (as a Pharisee!) with the long biblical lineage of Zadok dating back at least to the time of king David. In a related manner, the Hebrew sobriquets associated with the sons of Zadok in the Dead Sea Scrolls sectarian literature might thus also fit into such a political conflict concerning hereditary succession to the leadership of the Jerusalem temple. This is an important possibility to explore since there are implications of considerable impact as this reference to Zadok could thus link Josephus to the sectarian texts of Qumran.

Doctrinal positions concerning the historical origins of Christianity and Judaism which have been maintained by scholars and theologians since classical and medieval times are being seen in many new perspectives, if not at times greatly challenged by the archaeological evidence from the past two hundred years and various recently discovered texts which have not been seen since ancient times. Still existing ancient sources such as Pliny, Philo and Josephus may now be seen in a different light than was possible even sixty years ago. Thus traditions about Zadok and the Essenes may be further related to the religious politics and history of the Seleucids and also to an archaeological site in Egypt in the Nome of Heliopolis called Leontopolis where a Jewish Zadokite temple was built in the second century BCE.

This schismatic Zadokite temple, established in Leontopolis in Seleucid times by a Jerusalem high priest named Onias, is described by Josephus at various points and is also mentioned in the Talmud as Beth Onias. Although the importance of this site and its temple has been suggested by various scholars since the 1950s, their insights have been

---

7 It seems likely that the legitimacy of which sons of Zadok was a source of some dispute, perhaps going back as far as the time of Nehemiah which lists (3:4) Zadok, son of Baana; (3:29) Zadok, son of Immer and (11:11) Meshullam son of Zadok son of Meraioth, the son of Ahitub also mentioned in Ezra 7:2. I am following Matthew A. Collins who uses the word 'sobriquet' rather than the more colloquial and perhaps more loaded older apocalyptic eschatological "code word". There would be quite arrange between perspectives of the initiated and the less sympathetic outside observers which will be discussed further below.

8 The Seleucid Empire controlled Jerusalem during Onias III's tenure as High Priest in the mid second century BCE. Although Seleucus IV Philopator was friendly to the Jews and defrayed all expenses connected with their sanctuary, according to 2 Maccabees, a Hellenizing official of the Temple, Simon, a member of the Tribe of Benjamin, induced Seleucus through his official Heliodorus to plunder the Temple. The attempt was unsuccessful and the court never forgave the Onias. When Antiochus IV Epiphanes became king in 175 BCE, Onias was obliged to yield to his own brother, Jason, a Hellenizer. According to Josephus (Antiquities 12.237ff, Jason became high priest after the death of Onias III, the latter's son, who bore the same name, being then a minor. It is strange that both father and son should have been named Onias, and still more strange is the statement of Josephus that the high priest who succeeded Jason and was the brother of Onias and Jason, likewise was called Onias, and did not assume the name of Menelaus until later; for according to this statement there must have been two brothers of the same name. This confusion may be due to the Greek transcription of the related Hebrew names Johanan, Honiyya, and Nehonya, which makes the account of Josephus appear wholly unreliable. Archaeological discoveries have shed some light on this problem of identifying the successors of Onias III but the history is still uncertain.
generally ignored or have been seen as of only limited interest by mainstream scholarship. There may well have been a link however between the sectarian texts found in the caves above Qumran and the growth and operation of this Egyptian Zadokite Jewish temple which had been rarely considered. From the time of Alexander the Great’s death in 323 BCE, the leadership of Judea vacillated between the political control and influence of the Ptolemies in Egypt and the Seleucids in Antioch and Babylon. Various sides both Jewish and Hellenistic were represented by a variety of individuals Zadokite, Babylonian, Hasmonean and otherwise continually vying for greater influence and power. Sectarian texts such as the Damascus Covenant, the Manual of Discipline and the War Scroll must at least be considered within this geographical context of religious, military and political


10 On possible connections to the Dead Sea Scrolls, H.H. Rowley suggested as early as 1952 a connection between some of the Qumran literature and the Oniads, a breakaway group from Jerusalem under the leadership of Onias IV, the next legitimate Zadokite high priest who never held office because of the events of the Maccabean war, in his “The Internal Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” Analecta Levantina Biblia et Orientalia Ser. II. Fasc. 30 (1952), page 270, see also pages 257-276. See also Robert Hayward, “The Jewish Temple at Leontopolis: A Reconsideration” Journal of Jewish Studies - Essays in Honour of Yigael Yadin (The Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies Vol. XXXIII, 1-2 Spring-Autumn 1982, p. 429, “One of the most intriguing episodes in the history of the age of the Second Temple is the foundation at Leontopolis of a Jewish temple served by legitimate priests and Levites. It was built sometime in the second century B.C., and was closed by order of Rome in 74 A.D. In recent years, scholars have once again drawn attention to its importance.”; Paul A. Rainbow, “The Last Oniad and the Teacher of Righteousness” Journal of Jewish Studies Vol. XLVIII 1997, pp. 30-52; Joan E. Taylor, “A Second Temple in Egypt: The Evidence for the Zadokite Temple of Onias” Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period vol. XXIX (Leiden, Boston, Köln:Brill, 1998), pp. 297-321. Taylor conclusion (pp. 320f.), “Furthermore, the connection between the “Zadokites” of the documents in the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus and the Zadokites of the Egyptian temple built by Onias III should surely be investigated further. If the group which lived in Qumran and other sites southwards along the Dead Sea were led by Zadokites, then what were their connections with the Zadokite group in Egypt? The origins of the groups evidenced in the Scrolls may yet be more complex than hitherto supposed. Finally, it may perhaps be worth remembering that the Damascus Document was originally found down the road from Heliopolis, in Cairo. An Egyptian link has been there all along.” Other exceptions include, Solomon H. Steckoll, ’The Qumran Sect in Relation to the Temple of Leontopolis’, Revue de Qumran, vi, 1 (Feb. 1967), 55-69 and also “Preliminary Excavation Report in the Qumran Cemetery,” Revue de Qumran 6 (1968):323-44. Steckoll argued that Qumran was a place of worship linked to Egypt. His attempts to introduce modern archaeological and textual evidence to excavations of the cemetery at Qumran were dismissed by Roland de Vaux who went so far as to call Steckoll a “Sherlock Holmes of Archaeology” in his Schweich Lectures of the British Academy Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls 1959, p. 48.
upheaval. The Zadok temple in Egypt was an ongoing critic of the Hasmonean control of Jerusalem after the Maccabean war and the possibility must be considered that it was also an important influence, if not instigator, of many possible attempts by the displaced Zadokite descendants to recover what they considered to be their rightful place as leaders of the Judean temple theocracy.

Consideration of the Leontopolis temple's significance and importance to the related events leading up to the Jewish War and destruction of the Jerusalem Temple in 70 CE may have been further obscured by the pervasive view equated with the prevailing post-1950s scholarly orthodoxy that the Dead Sea Scrolls were produced by a devote peaceful monastic religious community of Essenes at Qumran. However the efforts, of at least some of the surviving strands of Judaism whose texts came down to us, to distance themselves from the Egyptian Zadokite group after their defeat by Rome in 70 CE may also be seen to have played a major role. That Qumran was originally a military fort and may have actually continued to have military significance until the advent of the Jewish War has received comparatively little scholarly attention until recently. Josephus however wrote for an audience who may very well have known a great deal more about the significance of Zadok, the Egyptian Jewish temple, their literature and quite possibly Qumran and the Essenes than we moderns may have fully appreciated. At the beginning of book 18 of Antiquities Josephus can be seen in this light to be telling his audience that there was a severance between Zadokite doctrine and its hereditary claims which had until then been solely tied to the Egyptian Beth Onias. Josephus can be seen to make this in fact explicit at least in part concerning their motivations as newly tied to the Pharisees in Antiquities 18.23-4a

11 On this topic see especially Robert R. Cargill, The Fortress at Qumran: A History of Interpretation, Centre for the Digital Humanities - Qumran Visualization Project, UCLA, May 2009, http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/qumfort.shtml accessed Sept. 13, 2015. For the more traditional somewhat sceptical view see John J. Collins, "Sectarian Communities in the Dead Sea Scrolls," IN Timothy H. Lim, John J. Collins (eds) The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Oxford University Press pp. 165-67. Collins states (p.165), "While some of the suggestions about the nature of the site—rustic villa (Donceel and Donceel-Voute 1994), pottery factory (Magen and Peleg 2006)—border on the ridiculous, the idea that it might have been a fortress is not inherently implausible. It is agreed that there was a fort there in the pre-exilic period. It was evidently destroyed by military assault in 68 CE. Roland de Vaux (1973: 42) believed that the Romans maintained a small garrison there after the site was destroyed in 68 CE. He noted that ‘from the plateau of Qumran the view extends over the whole of the western shore from the mouth of the Jordan to Ras Feshka and over the whole southern half of the sea’. The view that Qumran was also a fortress in the Hasmonean period has also been proposed especially by Norman Golb (1995).” Collins’ critiques that the cemetery of about 1200 males does not equate with a known battle of that magnitude and he questions what the supposed miqva’oth had to do with a military operation.

As for the fourth of the philosophies, Judas the Galilean set himself up as the leader of it. This school agrees in all other respects with the Pharisees; except that they have a passion for liberty that is almost unconquerable, since they are convinced that God alone is their leader and master (δεσπότην). They think little of submitting to death in unusual forms and permitting vengeance to fall on kinsmen and friends if only they may avoid calling any man lord (δεσπότην). In as much as most people have seen the steadfastness of their resolution amid such circumstances, I may forgo any further account. For I have no fear that anything reported of them will be considered incredible...

While Josephus does not explicitly equate this movement with the Zadokite writings as possibly from Egypt and the aspirations of the displaced Zadokites there, his earlier reference to a Zadok Pharisee would almost certainly have been an oxymoron as far as either the Zadokites or the Pharisees were concerned since they were seldom if ever previously allied together. There are important further indications elsewhere in Josephus which can be seen to relate further to these issues which we will examine further below.

The later chapters of the prophet Ezekiel (40-48) with its emphasis on the sons of Zadok, a new division of the land and an eschatological stream from the Temple running towards the Dead Sea apparently near Qumran are important biblical passages to examine in this regard. Steven Shawn Tuell has pointed out that the boundaries of the tribes, priests and prince in here can be seen as derived from the times of Ezra and Nehemiah and the Persian period. That these features have important parallels to supposed sectarian themes in the Qumran corpus has already been recognized. Devorah Dimant and others have reaffirmed that the origins of the Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls sectarian literature realistically date from c. 200 BCE when the Seleucids took control of the land of Israel from the Ptolemies. It was only subsequent to this that control of Jerusalem eventually passed to the Hasmoneans from the

---


14 For example recently Gary T. Manning Jr. has discussed how the Damascus Document (CD 3.2ff) and 5Q15 both make use of Ezekiel 44:15, see Gary T. Manning Jr., Echoes of a Prophet: The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period, London: T&T Clark, (2004), p. 42.

Zadokites. However at first there were schisms within the Zadokite leadership itself which can be seen to have influenced at least some of this literature. In terms of specific instances of literature dating from this period and even earlier, Dimant notes Michael E. Stone’s third-century BCE dating of the Astronomic Book (=1 Enoch 72-82) and Aramaic Levi Document. She further cites Eyal Regev’s suggestion that the halakhah in the Temple Scroll, 4QMMT and Jubilees precedes the full development of the sectarian viewpoint and Alexander Rofé’s suggestion that the Jewish sects of the second century BCE had antecedents such as Trito-Isaiah, Ben Sira and Malachi in the third or fourth century BCE.

As Josephus makes clear in a decree which he attributes to Antiochus (Antiquities 12.138-44), the Seleucids had long portrayed themselves as following in the administrative traditions of Cyrus the Persian: including in their policies towards Jerusalem and its temple theocracy. Antiochus I had constructed Seleucia, on the Tigris just 60 km north of Babylon, as the capital of the Seleucid empire. The acceptance of Babylonian religious tradition by Antiochus I Soter (c. 324-261 BCE) is an important reality in considering the history of Jewish-Seleucid relations. Antiochus I was half Persian since his mother Apama was herself Iranian. He grew up in Babylon and had never known Greece. Important

---

19 Josephus states (William Whiston translation): “King Antiochus to Ptolemy, sends greetings:--Since the Jews, upon our first entrance on their country, demonstrated their friendship toward us; and when we came to their city of [Jerusalem], received us in a splendid manner, and came to meet us with their elders, and gave abundance of provisions to our soldiers, and to the elephants, and joined with us in ejecting the garrison of the Egyptians that were in the citadel, we have thought fit to reward them, and to retrieve the condition of their city, which has been greatly depopulated by such accidents as have befallen its inhabitants, and to bring those who have been scattered abroad back to the city; and, in the first place, we have determined, on account of their piety toward God, to bestow on them, as a pension, for their sacrifices of animals that are fit for sacrifice, for wine and oil, and frankincense, the value of twenty thousand pieces of silver, and [six] sacred artabae (about 240 litres) of fine flour, with one thousand four hundred and sixty medimni (1 medimni = 50 litres) of wheat, and three hundred and seventy-five medimni of salt; and these payments I would have fully paid them, as I have sent orders to you. I would also have the work about the temple finished, and the cloisters, and if there be anything else that ought to be rebuilt; and for the materials of wood, let it be brought to them out of Judea itself and out of the other countries, and out of Libanus tax free; and the same I would have observed as to those other materials which will be necessary, in order to render the temple more glorious; and let all of that nation live according to the laws of their own country; and let the elders, and the priests, and the scribes of the temple, and the sacred singers, be discharged from poll money and the crown tax and other taxes also; and that the city may the sooner recover its inhabitants, I grant a discharge from taxes for three years to its present inhabitants, and to such as shall come to it, until the month of Hyperberetatos. We also discharge them for the future from a third part of their taxes, that the losses they have sustained may be repaired; and all those citizens that have been carried away, and have become slaves, we grant them and their children their freedom; and order that their substance be restored to them.” On this see the important article by Niels Hyldeh, “The Maccabean Rebellion and the Question of ‘Hellenization’” IN Religion and Religious Practice in the Seleucid Kingdom, Aarhus:Aarhus University Press, 1990, 1996, pp. 188-203.
parallels to Cyrus the Persian's edict to the Jews (2 Chronicles 36:22-23; Ezra 1:1-4) can be seen in the following ancient Assyrian Borsippa inscription concerning his Seleucid rebuilding of the Marduk temple (the Esaglia) and the god Nabu's temple of wisdom (Ezida):

_I am Antiochus, the great king, the legitimate king, the king of the world, king of Babylon, king of all countries, the caretaker of the temples Esagila and Ezida, the first-born son of king Seleucus, the Macedonian, king of Babylon. When I conceived the idea of constructing Esagila and Ezida, I formed with my august hands (when I was still) in the country of Hatti (namely in Syria) the first brick for Esagila and Ezida with the finest oil and brought (it with me) for the laying of the foundations of Esagila and Ezida._

The Esaglia and Ezida were central to the Babylonian celebration of New Year, a Mesopotamian parallel to the centrality of the Jewish Rosh Hashannah and the day of Atonement in ancient Judaism. When the Babylonians celebrated the New Year (the Akitu festival) they remembered how Marduk had created order in the universe. In the poem _Enûma eliš_ it is stated that all other gods are just manifestations of Marduk. Thus Antiochus I was associating himself annually with the beginnings of all creation and the god of all the gods. From the time of the sack of Babylon during the reign of Sennacherib for twenty years into the reign of Esarhaddon this festival had not been celebrated in Babylon. It is unclear how the conquest of Alexander the Great had impacted the situation but during the earlier disruption, as Stephanie Dalley describes

QUOTE overtly, an Assyrian version of part of the Epic of Creation used syncretism with Anshar to put an Assyrian deity, whether Ashur or Ishtar, as the hero-god in place of Babylon's patron god Marduk, making appropriate changes in the early genealogy of the primeval gods. At the culmination of the epic in its Babylonian version Marduk supervised the building of Babylon by the gods; but with Babylon out of the question and an Assyrian version with Marduk replaced by an Assyrian deity, the city name too must have been altered in the revised text. Presumably Ashur city took the role when Ashur was the hero-god, and Nineveh took that role when Ishtar of Nineveh took the leading part. Written in the reign of Sennacherib, the small part of the Assyrian version that is extant shows that he made deliberate modifications to the composition as part of his policy to elevate Assyria to supreme status, using techniques that were already in use. Although the wording changed in

Translation by Leo Oppenheim IN James B. Pritchard, _Ancient Near Eastern Texts_ Princeton, 1969, p. 317. Cited by Javier Teixidor, "Interpretations and Misinterpretations of the East in Hellenistic Times," _IN Religion and Religious Practice in the Seleucid Kingdom_, Aarhus:Aarhus University Press, 1990, 1996, p. 72. See also http://www.livius.org/cg-cm/chronicles/antiochus_cylinder/antiochus_cylinder2.html Teixidor mentions the departure from Seleucid Greek inscription practice here, "In this inscription written in Akkadian the king, contrary to the Seleucid practice, gives himself the normal titles of the Mesopotamian monarchs; also he describes his action as accomplished in accordance with the ritual traditionally performed when consecrating a temple. The inscription thus becomes a true Hellenistic copy of the Neo-Babylonian building texts in which the pattern followed was always identical: the mention of the titles of the king, a summary account of the work accomplished, and a prayer to the god. (Langdon 1912).” See also Paul Kosmin, "Seeing Double in Seleucid Babylonia: Rereading the Borsippa Cylinder of Antiochus I" chapter 8 IN Alfonso Moreno and Rosalind Thomas (eds.), Patterns of the Past. Oxford; 2014. pp. 173-198.

http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/pjkosmin/files/seeing_double_in_seleucid_babylonia.pdf?m=1446291527
these particulars, the myth was essentially the same and had the authority of past scholarship. 21

Antiochus ends his Borsippa invocation with these words in Assyrian: *O Nebo, foremost son, when you enter Ezida, the (only) true temple, may there be on your lips (lit.:mouth) (words of) favor for Antiochus, the king of all countries, for Seleucus, the king, his son (and) for Stratonike (As-ta‘ar-ta-ni-ä-I(u), his consort, the queen!*

It is important to see these events in terms of their significance to contemporary Jews be they Babylonian or in Jerusalem itself.

The mention of Antiochus' queen Stratonike is also very significant in this inscription as mention of the queen was without Mesopotamian precedent. Her name in the original Assyrian may have been related to *Astarte*, to which Stratonike perhaps was a Greek divine name allusion. This adaptation by Antiochus of Mesopotamian tradition may well parallel the politically motivated changes to tradition by Esarhaddon and and Sennacherib already described. 22 Such political use of local historical religious traditions was an important background and stimulus to Jerusalem and the events leading up to the Maccabean war. Although the conflicts within (and from without!) the Seleucid empire caused the Syrian city of Antioch to grow in influence and power, Babylon and its Jewry remained an important dynamic in relations with Jerusalem. Indeed some of these developments threatened the temple in Jerusalem as well as the economics of its priesthood, its treasures, and its scriptures. The possibility that Qumran and the Dead Sea caves may have been where scriptures from the temple were secreted when Jerusalem was under threat has been raised since at least the 1990s. 23 It may even possibly have been the location cited in a letter at the beginning of 2 Maccabees where Jeremish is said to have hid the treasures of the Temple at the beginning of the Babylonian Exile (c. 597-581 BCE). 24

Although the radiocarbon dating results of 395-181 BCE for the *Testament of Qahat*, (the grandfather of Aaron and Moses) found at Qumran are usually ignored in favour of traditional paleographic dating for this text at 100-75 BCE, similar earlier shifts in dating

---


22 While Dalley's overall thesis that the elaborate gardens of Babylonian were actually in Nineveh as not been universally accepted (see critical review of Nigel Tallis, curator of Assyrian and Babylonian artefacts at the British Museum http://www.historyextra.com/book-review/mystery-hanging-garden-babylon-elusive-world-wonder-traced) her analysis of the political adaptation is on more solid ground. See also Julye Bidmead, *The Akītu estival: Religious Continuity and Royal Legitimation in Mesopotamia* Gorgias Press, 2004.

23 A major initial advocate of this view was Norman Golb, *Who wrote the Dead Sea scrolls?: The search for the secret of Qumran* New York: Scribner 1995.

24 See further below.
between radiocarbon and the accepted paleographic determinations exist for other texts found at Qumran as well.  

Perhaps the hard science of radiocarbon dating may be more accurate than scholarly conventions for dating scribal styles and if so, this may indicate that these scrolls are actually older than the Maccabean war rather than what many currently believe as based on what traditional paleographic dating has suggested.  

Thus there is at least the possibility that some of the scrolls might have been placed in the caves above Qumran prior to the Maccabean War.  There is, of course, the further possibility that the scrolls may have already been old when they were placed there.  

In any case as will be argued below, there may have been a long history of Jewish texts being stored in the caves already before the first century BCE.

The Greek terms Sadduc (Σαδδοκ) and Sadducee (Σαδδουκαίον) have clear connections to the Hebrew word being translated as either righteous (צדקא) and Zadok (جزيرة or זדוק), terms going back to King David and the prophet Zadok (and perhaps even earlier to the time of Abraham and king Melchizedek).  Although the name Pharisee (פרישא) is a Mishnaic Hebrew word (or targumic Aramaic פְּרִישָׁת) meaning literally "isolation' or 'separation', an earlier tradition may be indicated by Abraham Malamat's work on Mari texts where he has suggested possible roots of the Hellenistic and Roman period term Pharisee, to the much earlier Old Babylonian Akkadian πιρίστουμ, which Malamat argues was equivalent to the biblical סוד as the king's 'secret assembly.'  

If Malamat is correct in this early

---

25 Georges Bonaf, Susan Ivy, Willy Wölfli, Magen Broshi, Israel Carmi, and John Strugnell, 

26 Magen Broshi, "The Dead Sea Scrolls, the Sciences and New Technologies," Dead Sea Discoveries, Vol. 11, No. 2 (2004), pp. 133-142, argues (pp. 133-34) that "by and large, the dates suggested by the paleographers agree with those arrived at by the physicists." However there are concerns about the reliability of the calibration.


28 Abraham Malamat, "The Secret Council and Prophetic Involvement in Mari and Israel" in Mari and the Bible (Leiden:Brill, 1998), p. 135; originally published in R. Liwak and S. Wagner, (eds.), Prophetic und geschichtliche Wirklichkeit im alten Israel (FS S Herrmann), Stuttgart 1991, pp. 231-236.  Malamat lists Mari documents ARM 26/1, no. 101 (p. 266 and cf. pp. 237/8); no. 104 (p. 270 and cf. pp. 21, 237/8); no. 206 (pp. 434 ff., cf. p. 381), plus vo. 26/2, no. 307 (p. 64); and no. 429 (pp. 329) .  However Malamat discusses only the three documents in the first volume at the time of Zimri-Lim, King of Mari "for they alone are connected with the diviners who attend the secret council [טсанא] or are removed from it." In the Bible Malamat argues that this was called סוד .  According to The Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament, by R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer Jr., Bruce K. Waltke, originally published by Moody Press of Chicago, Illinois. (1980), the primary meaning of סוד is "confidential speech", hence, "counsel." The emphasis on confidentiality marks a distinction between this word and the more general פה "advice, " counsel." The word סוד stresses that intelligent counsel can be a key to good success (Prov 15:22).  It is extended to indicate a circle of trusted
etymology it may also be that the word Essene also had similar connections to the *assinnū/issinnū* in Mari texts as well as we will now consider.

The etymology and history of the name of the Essenes has not yet been as clearly established in modern scholarship as the names of the Pharisees or Zadok and the Sadducees. Philo the first century Egyptian Jewish apologist, writing before the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE. wrote in *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* (75), that the Essenes derived their name from their 'devotion' -δσιςτητος - a feminine Greek word meaning 'personified righteousness', 'religious service', 'devout', 'pious', 'divine law'. Various attempts have been made by modern scholars to derive a Semitic Hebrew or Aramaic origin for the term *essene* relating to this concept. Significantly for our present purposes it can be stated that there has been little investigation of a possible military religious service connection with the Essenes which may nevertheless also be related to a Semitic etymology through the *assinnū*. Unless the Essenes were so Hellenized as to simply have had a Greek name, it could be stated that it seems much more likely their name was a Hellenized sobriquet or nickname based on an original semitic Aramaic or Hebrew name for the group.29

For our present purposes their relations to the Zadokites/Sadduceees is also important for further investigation.

Given that the Hebrew *aleph* (א) can represent the medial *i* as well as the vowels *a*, *e*, and *o*, the related Old Babylonian terms *isinnu* and *assinnū* may thus be important to consider here.30 According to the University of Chicago Assyrian Dictionary, the *assinnū* (*isinnu*) was a member of the cultic personnel of Ishtar.31 With the meaning of *isinnu* as 'festival, feast day' (ascribed to a wide variety of deities) as well as the word being a designation of transferred meaning 'of battle' we can thus see possibilities for a sacred as well as military meaning for the Jewish Essene if this

intimates who give their advice (Psa 55:14 [H 15]; Psa 83:3 [H 4]). Hopefully, such friends will never stand against a man (Job 19:19) or reveal confidences (Prov 11:13; Prov 20:19; Prov 25:9). The wise and upright man who walks in the fear of the Lord will have God's secret counsel (Psa 25:14; Prov 3:32; Amos 3:7; cf. Job 15:8; Job 29:4). He will associate himself with others who likewise fear God (Psa 89:7 [H 8]) and sing his praises (Psa 111:1). He will disassociate himself from evil doers (Gen 49:6; Jer 15:17) and pray for deliverance from their evil machinations (Psa 64:2 [H 3]). God himself will oppose wicked counsels (Jer 23:18-22) and pour out his wrath upon their members (Jer 6:11) so that they have no place among the assembly of the righteous (Ezek 13:9). Bibliography:. Thomas, D. W., "The Interpretation of besod in Job 29:4," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 65:63-66. THAT, II, pp. 144-47. 29 James C Vanderkam, "The Identity and History of the Community", in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, vol. 2 (Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 1999), pp. 490-91.


etymology should prove correct. In the Old Babylonian period court of Mari there was an Annunītum temple with a military connection which also had assinnū priests that may also be very significant here.

As James Vanderkam has pointed out, the texts of Josephus which have come down to us use both the spellings Ἔσσαιο (as also found in Philo) and Ἔσσηνιο while the name is rendered Esseni in the Latin of Pliny. The Artemis priests mentioned in the ancient inscriptions from Ephesus were spelled Ἔσσήνες dating from the late fourth BCE until perhaps the early second century CE. Already in the nineteenth century Joseph Barber Lightfoot critiqued proposals associating these Greek terms with the Hebrew ḥasid, and ṣanua. James Vanderkam has reviewed a number of proposed Aramaic etymologies for 'Essene' beginning with that of Dupont-Sommer who, as had many scholars in earlier, pre-Qumran days, attempted to provide an Aramaic or Hebrew etymology for the term Essene that is attested only in Greek and Latin spellings. Vanderkam says of Dupont-Sommer's proposed etymology:

He derived it from Aramaic חסיד, ḥasid (“pious, holy”), with the endings found on the Greek spellings of the word (-ηνοι or -αιοι) being added to the Semitic base by authors who wrote in Greek. Philo seems to have known the same etymology, as he connects the word with ὁσιοι (“holy”). Dupont-Sommer was aware that his proposed derivation rested on a word attested not in Palestinian, but only in Eastern Aramaic. For him, however, this merely showed that the Essenes originated in the Jewish colonies of Mesopotamia, as various Irano-Babylonian influences demonstrated to his satisfaction. The French scholar believed that חסידים was the Hebrew equivalent and that the Hebrew form had given way to the old Aramaic term.

---

32 Jeremy Black, Andrew George, Nicholas Postgate (eds.), A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2nd (corrected printing), 2000, p. 131. They state the latter term means 'male cultic prostitute' but according to the Assyrian Dictionary there is no evidence for this. Both terms are related to Sumerian antecedents. See more recently, Ilona Zsolnay, "The Misconstrued Role of the Assinnu in Ancient Near Eastern Prophecy," in Jonathan Stökl and Corrine L. Carvalho eds., Prophets Male and Female - Gender and Prophecy in the Hebrew Bible, the Eastern Mediterranean, and the Ancient Near East (Atlanta: Society of biblical Literature, 2013), pp. 81-99. Zsolnay concludes her article, "That assinnū are connected to prophecy is a result of their connection to Ištar, specifically to the Ištar of war, Annunītum. This connection, however, relies on their martial natures and not on their sexualities nor on their occasional ability to prophesy."

33 Joseph Barber Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon (MacMillan and Company, 1879) p. 357. Lightfoot was critiquing the Bohemian-German Rabbi Zecharias Frankel Zeitschrift für die religiösen Interessen des Judenthums Leipzig, 1846 p. 449. and pp. 454, 455; Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums 1853, p. 32.

Stephen Goranson suggested "do', 'fashion' accomplish').

However, it is worth noting that over a century ago Edward Lee Hicks proposed a possible Semitic origin for the term Essene and he suggested a possible Jewish connection to the college of priests of the the cult of Artemis at Ephesus:

Whether the title Μέλισσαι was known at Ephesos or not, the bee was the regular type on the Ephesian coins ... and an important college of priests at the Artemision was entitled οί Έσσήνες. Perhaps the title was of oriental, and even of Semitic origin, and Bp. Lightfoot (Colossians, p. 96) may be wrong in considering its resemblance to the name of the Jewish sect of Essenes to be entirely accidental. Popular etymology however derived the word from ἐσμός, and connected it with the type on the coins, with the meaning of 'king-bee.' The Essenes are often named in the inscriptions. Neither their number nor mode of appointment is known.

Bishop Joseph Lightfoot had earlier argued (p. 96) a connection between the reference in Acts 19:13 to Jews practising exorcisms (τῶν περιερχομένων Ἰουδαίων ἐξορκιστῶν) at Ephesus and statements in Josephus about the Essenes. In the biblical Book of Acts passage (19:13-19) there is a reference to books relating to the practice of magic (τῶν τὰ περίεργα πραξάντων) at Ephesus as well:

Then some itinerant Jewish exorcists tried to use the name of the Lord Jesus over those who had evil spirits, saying, "I adjure you by the Jesus whom Paul proclaims." Seven sons of a Jewish high priest named Sceva were doing this. But the evil spirit said to them in reply, "Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are you?" Then the man with the evil spirit leaped on them, mastered them all, and so overpowered them that they fled out of the house naked and wounded. When this became known to all residents of Ephesus, both Jews and Greeks, everyone was awestruck; and the name of the Lord Jesus was praised. Also many of those

---

who became believers confessed and disclosed their practices. A number of those who practiced magic collected their books and burned them publicly; when the value of these books was calculated, it was found to come to fifty thousand silver coins.

The statement in Josephus' *Jewish War* (2.136) about the Essenes referred to by Lightfoot:

*They also take great pains in studying the writings of the ancients, and choose out of them what is most for the advantage of their soul and body; and they inquire after such roots and medicinal stones as may cure their distempers.*

He connected further with a statement about King Solomon in *Antiquities* 8.45.37

*God also enabled him to learn that skill which expels demons, which is a science useful and wholesome to men. He composed such incantations also by which distempers are alleviated. And he left behind him the manner of using exorcisms, by which they drive away demons, so that they never return; and this method of cure is of great force to this day; for I have seen a certain man of my own country, whose name was Eleazar, releasing people that were demonic in the presence of Vespasian, and his sons, and his captains, and the whole multitude of his soldiers. The manner of the cure was this: he put a ring, that had a root of one of those sorts mentioned by Solomon to the nostrils of the demoniac, after which he drew out the demon through his nostrils; and when the man fell down immediately, he warned him to return into him no more, making still mention of Solomon, and reciting the incantations which he composed. And when Eleazar would persuade and demonstrate to the spectators that he had such a power, he set a little way off a cup or basin full of water, and commanded the demon, as he went out of the man, to overturn it, and thereby to let the spectators know that he had left the man; and when this was done, the skill and wisdom of Solomon was shown very manifestly: for which reason it is, that all men may know the vastness of Solomon's abilities, and how he was beloved of God, and that the extraordinary virtues of every kind with which this king was endowed, may not be unknown to any people under the sun for this reason, I say, it is that we have proceeded to speak so much of these matters.*

While Lightfoot stated (p. 96, n.1) that he could "only regard it as an accidental coincidence that the *epulones* of the Ephesian Artemis were called Essenes", it now appears that Hicks is right in challenging Lightfoot's dismissal. It may be that the dynamics of St Paul's conflict with the cult of Diana at Ephesus also needs to consider the implications and possibility of such connections.

Although Anthony Hilhorst was very critical in his 1987 review of Allen H. John's *Essenes of Israel and the Priests of Artemis*, which had also argued a connection between the Essenes of the cult of Artemis in Ephesus and the Jewish Essenes described in Josephus and other ancient authors such as Philo and Pliny, they both can be faulted for overlooking the general characteristic of sobriquets as being often difficult to define and locate exactly in

---

37 Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* p. 91, n. 2.
time and history as well as in Hillhorst's case, the lack of exact conventions in the spelling of ancient names in texts from antiquity:

In any case the author’s assumption of the name Essenes for the Qumran sect being derived by Hellenists and Hellenized Jews from the name of the Artemis priests cannot be substantiated from any document (moreover these priests are called Ἐσσήνας, whereas the Jewish sect is called Ἐσσηνοί or Ἐσσαῖοι). 38

Hilhorst may well have been correct about the lack of a direct connection as the evidence from Ephesus is more than two centuries earlier, but as illustrated by Ancient Near Eastern traditions generally, religious traditions and roles continued for millennia with many of the aspects virtually unchanged. Hilhorst's critique of the variant spellings also overlooks the widespread differences in the spelling of names within ancient texts both within Josephus himself and indeed the lack of exact conventions within manuscript traditions from antiquity generally; ranging from biblical to all other genres. Also the influence of the assinnu if it extended to Ephesus a couple of centuries earlier could well be argued to show how pervasive their influence already was across a broad geographic area.

While Jones may well have also been in error about the precise connection between the Jewish Essenes and those of Artemis, 39 Hilhorst is nevertheless premature in excluding the possibility of any connection between the names of the two groups. For his part, Jones makes no mention of the early debate between Hicks and Hicks cited above. Importantly Lightfoot was also of the opinion that Ἐσσήνας was "probably not a Greek word, as other terms connected with the worship of the Ephesian Artemis (e.g. μεγάβυζος, a Persian word) point to an oriental or at least a non-Greek origin already at Ephesus prior to Hellenistic times." 40 According to Herodotus, Persian Wars, 7.83 Megabyzus (μεγάβυζος) son of Zopyrus was the name of a Persian general. 41 The possibility of a Persian connection is


39 Jones (Ibid.) suggested that it was "the Jewish sect's celibacy' which caused Hellenized Jews "in their distorted way" to see it as "resembling practices followed by the priests of Artemis, the Great Mother of a neighboring religion" (p. 124).

40 Lightfoot cites the Latin text of Ernesto Guhl, Ephesica Berolini Prostat in Libraria Friderici Nicolai, 1843 (p. 106ff.) and Thomas Gaisford's edition of the Etymologicum Magnum (Oxford, 1848), col. 347 whose etymology related to the king bee Lightfoot described as one of "several absurd derivations of the word."

41 Hicks cited (p. 84) Strabo's Geography (14.1) statement concerning the Temple in Ephesus: The priests were eunuchs, who were called Megabyzi. It was the practice to send to various places for persons worthy of this office, and they were held in high honour. They were obliged to appoint virgins as their colleagues in their priesthood. At present some of their rites and customs are observed, and some are neglected. See also the accounts in Diodorus Siculus Library (10.19); Herodotus The Histories (3.70); Thucydides Peloponnesian War (1.109); Xenophon Anabasis (5.3), Cyropaedia (8.6); Appian Civil Wars (5.1); Plutarch Alexander (42); Diogenes Laertius Lives of Eminent Philosophers (2.6); T. Maccius Plautus Bacchides (2.3); Pliny the Elder Natural History (35.36).
worthy of further investigation, especially in the light of Xenophon's *Anabasis* and its subsequent influence on Alexander the Great's eastern campaign and the Seleucids.

Ilona Zsolnay, in her "The Misconstrued Role of the Assinnu in Ancient Near Eastern Prophecy," discusses the ambiguity of the term *assinnu* in terms of its derivation from the Sumerian *saĝ.ur.saĝ* and *lu₂* *ur.sal*.\(^{42}\)

According to certain cuneiform lexical texts, the logographic equivalences for the Akkadian term *assinnu* are *saĝ.ur.saĝ* and *lu₂* *ur.sal*. Translated literally, *saĝ.ur.saĝ* means either “hero” or “lead hero”; thus Adam Falkenstein suggests “heldenhaften Mannen” (heroic men), while Wilfred G. Lambert conjectures that the term could mean “companion of a warrior or batman.” These would seem to be definitive translations, except that the alternative logographic equivalent *lu₂* *ur.sal* could mean “bitch,” “lioness,” “woman-man,” or “feminine man” among other possibilities. The last equivalence, which is not attested until the Neo-Assyrian period, has led some scholars to conclude that the *assinnu* was a temple prostitute or homosexual.\(^{43}\)


\(^{43}\) Ilona Zsolnay, (p. 85f). describes the CAD definition as "Due to a dearth of evidence and perhaps seeking to quell notions of Mesopotamian homosexuality and temple prostitution, the CAD defines an assinnu as simply “a member of the cultic personnel of Ištar,” cryptically adding at the end of the entry that “The [assinnu] seems to have functioned mainly in the cult of Ištar, to have sung specific songs and dressed in distinctive garments. There is no specific evidence that he was a eunuch or a homosexual; the Era passage may mean simply that Ištar turned his interest from the masculine role to the feminine role.”". She elaborates, "ur.saĝ = “hero”; nam.ur.saĝ = “heroism”; and, saĝ = “front,” “head,” or “first.” saĝ in this instance could also be acting as a signifier (similar to lu₂), thus carrying the meaning “individual” and having no English correspondence. ... lu₂ = the determinative for “person” or “being;” ur = “dog,” “lion,” “man,” “servant,” etc.; and sal, if read sal, = “feminine” or “thin”; or, if read munus, = “woman,” or “female.” It is even possible that the meaning for lu₂.ur.munus could be “servant of women.” (The reading “female servant” for lu₂.ur.sal is unlikely, as this is regularly rendered geme2 [sal.kur].) She cites Adam Falkenstein, “Sumerische religiöse Texte,” ZA 52 (1957): 56–75. In “A Hymn to Inanna and Her Self-Praise,” JCS 40 (1988): 165–86, Ake W. Sjoberg contends that these two lines indicate that the *assinnu* had duties other than “cultic assignments.”(177). This conclusion was rejected by Samuel N. Kramer (review of Adam Falkenstein, *Sumerische und akkadische Hymnen und Gebete*, BiOr 11 [1954]: 170–76, esp. 175 n. 32), who argues the *saĝ.ur.saĝ* are merely temple personnel. Wilfred G. Lambert, “Prostitution,” in Haas, *Aussenseiter und Randgruppen*, 127–57. Maul, “Kurgarru und assinnu,” who argues that the presence of transsexuals and homosexuals in the cult of Ištar were meant to incite fear in the people who witnessed their actions in order to regiment behavior; and Gertrud Farber-Plüegg, *Der Mythos “Inanna und Enki” unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Liste der ME* (StP 10; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1973), who, even though accepting that an *assinnu* may merely have been a courtier, defines the *saĝ.ur.saĝ* as a temple prostitute or temple attendant (248). Julia Assante, “Bad Girls and Kinky Boys? The Modern Prostitution of Ištar, Her Clergy and Her Cults,” in *Tempelprostitution im Altertum: Fakten und Fiktionen* (ed. Tanja S. Scheer; Oikumene 6; Berlin: Antike, 2009), 23–54. As far as the first Mesopotamian lexical lists are concerned she cites Jonathan
It is meaning 'lead hero' or 'companion of a warrior' that would seem most important in the Jewish context of Josephus' account. However the ambiguity would also appear to have a legacy here as well.

Susan Ackermann, in her discussion of the ambiguity of eros in the heroic Mesopotamian Epic of Gilgamesh, compares the views of Anne Draftkorn Kilmer, Wilfried G. Lambert and Martti Nissinen on the ḥassinnu(m)/assinnu(m) pun found in Gilgamesh's axe-dream vision on the missing beginning of Tablet II taken from the large Old Babylonian Pennsylvania tablet. As Ackermann works her way through the eroticised imagery in the epic, including Ishtar's son Gilgamesh's dream about meteors and axes, the wordplay on kisru (meteor) and kezru (male with curled hair, denoting status of a prostitute) and ḥassinnu(m) (axe) and assinnu(m) (as another male associated with the Ishtar worship), the (euphemistic) wrestling match between the two men that ends in kissing, Gilgamesh's wife-like mourning over Enkidu's death, and Gilgamesh's vehement rejection of Ishtar's sexual advances and his preference for hunting and male companionship over marriage she discusses the interpretations of other scholars but of course like in so many other aspects of Mesopotamian religion and culture, Jewish belief and practice can be seen as a somewhat different response.

Some connection with this issue of military leadership, gender and the role of eros and its rejection in Jewish worship is evident in an episode said to have resulted in Onias' IV's flight to Egypt in the events leading up to the Maccabean war. According to both the Palestinian Talmud Yoma 6.3 43c-d and the parallel Babylonian Talmud Mas. Menachoth

Taylor, “Babylonian Lists of Words and Signs,” in The Babylonian World (ed. Gwendolyn Leick; New York: Routledge, 2007), 432–46; Niek Veldhuis, “How Did They Learn Cuneiform? ‘Tribute/Word List C’ as an Elementary Exercise,” in Approaches to Sumerian Literature in Honour of Stip (H. L. J. Vanstiphout) (ed. Piotr Michalowski and Niek Veldhuis; CM 35; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 181–200; idem, “Continuity and Change in the Mesopotamian Lexical Tradition,” in Aspects of Genre and Type in Pre-Modern Literary Cultures (ed. Bert Roest and Herman L. J. Vanstiphout; COMERS Communications 1; Groningen: Styx, 1999), 101–18; Miguel Civil, “Ancient Mesopotamian Lexicography,” CANE 4:181–200 and states, “Although certain early lexical lists, such as the simple corollary lists, can be extraordinarily useful, they do not provide any definition other than to equate one Sumerian lexeme with one Akkadian lexeme. Furthermore, depending on the period to which they are dated, the terms listed may not have been fully understood by the scribe who indeed copied the list. Thus, other than to provide simple logographic or syllabic equivalences, these types of lists are of little help in accurate translation/interpretation. This situation is exacerbated in the case of the synonym lists. Created during the first millennium, in these lists all conceivable and inconceivable Sumerian words are given for a Babylonian word.”

(109b) Onias IV’s flight to Egypt (c. 164 B.C.E.) was the result of his brother, Shimei, deceiving him into serving at the altar dressed in woman's rather than the High Priest's garments which might also possibly relate to our present discussion of priestly traditions relating to the clothing of the Istar *assinnu.* Amram Tropper translates the Palestinian Talmud account:

Forty years Simeon the Righteous served Israel in the high priesthood and in the final year he said to them: During this year I shall die. They said to him: Whom shall we appoint after you? He said to them: Behold Onias my son is before you. They went and appointed Onias, and Simeon his brother was jealous of him. He (Simeon) went and put a gown on him (Onias) and girded him with a girdle. He said to them: See what he promised his beloved. He said to her when I serve in the high priesthood I’ll put on your gown and gird your girdle. They looked into the matter and did not find him. They said from there he fled to the Mountain of the King and from there he fled to Alexandria, and he stood and built there an altar, and regarding it read the passage “In that day there shall be an altar to the Lord inside the land of Egypt” (Isaiah 19,19). Behold this matter is an *a fortiori*: If one who fled power see how he coveted it in the end, one who is empowered and then removed from power all the more so (will covet power in the end)! It was learned (in a baraita): these are the words of R. Meir.

R. Judah says: No, rather they appointed Simeon and Onias his brother was jealous of him. He (Onias) went and put a gown on him (Simeon) and girded him with a girdle. He said to them: See what he promised his beloved, and the rest (of the story unfolded) as (presented) previously. Behold this matter is an *a fortiori*: If one who was not (even) empowered see how he incited Israel to idolatry, one who was empowered and then removed from power all the more so (will incite Israel to idolatry)!

In his analysis, Amram Tropper considers this shorter Palestinian account of this story to be closer to the original than the one in the Babylonian Talmud. He argues that the tradition of Rabbi Meir was likely more truthful than that of Rabbi Judah.

For R. Judah, Onias is the trickster and Simeon the dupe but for R. Meir, Simeon is the trickster and Onias the dupe. R. Meir thus ascribes the foundation of an illicit high place to an innocent and well-meaning high priest who was also Simeon the Righteous’s rightful heir, while depicting Simeon the Righteous’s *de facto* heir as a duplicitous fiend. Understandably this startling portrayal of the good schismatic and the evil leader of the Jerusalem establishment may well have disturbed some sages in late antiquity. By contrast, R. Judah’s negative view of Onias and positive view of

---

45 A. Leo Oppenheim, et. al (eds.), *The Assyrian Dictionary*, Vol. I A Part II Chicago:Oriental Institute, 1968, pp. 341f. "The *a.* seems to have functioned mainly in the cult of Istar, to have sung specific songds and dressed in distinctive garments. There is no specific evidence that he was a eunuch or a homosexual;" According to Felix Gössmann’s *Era IV* p. 55, Ishtar changed the *assinnu* "from men into women to show the people piety."

Simeon is far less surprising. R. Meir’s account, consequently, is the *lectio difficilior*, the more difficult reading, and most likely the more original of the two. R. Meir’s positive portrayal of Onias and negative portrayal of Simeon apparently disturbed R. Judah (or, the author of the narrative attributed to him), who consequently reversed the moral stature of the two characters in order to condemn the schismatic sanctuary and salvage the honor of the Jerusalem temple.47

Although this is a somewhat late caricatured and abbreviated version of the actual historical truth of what occurred, the result was perhaps also somehow related to the schism concerning the "wicked priest" described by sectarian Qumran sources such as the Damascus or Zadokite Document first discovered in the late nineteenth century in the Cairo

47 Ibid. p. 170. Tropper (p. 173f) rejects the view of Ben-Zion Luria, "Mihu honia?" Beir Miqra (5727, 1966) in Hebrew, pp. 65-81 of separate sources. Tropper states, "The Babylonian Talmud’s twin foundation stories for the temple of Onias are so similar to the Palestinian Talmud’s counterparts in respect to substance, plotline, details and vocabulary that there is obviously a close genetic connection, a close causal relationship, between the parallel presentations.... Since the Babylonian Talmud’s expansions consist primarily of clarifications and embellishments, i.e. additions and adjustments of an editorial nature, one is well-justified in applying here the traditional text-critical principle, *lectio brevior lectio potior*—the shorter reading is the more probable one. Indeed, it seems highly unlikely that the Palestinian Talmud would have omitted all these details had it known them.” However another possibility is that the reader and audience's collective memory knew more details than the story was telling. To me this is the flaw with Tropper's statement (p. 160), "Since the temple stood and operated for over two hundred years, it is truly striking that the only ancient references to it appear in Josephus’s writings and rabbinic literature. No other sources from Palestine or the diaspora explicitly relate to the temple of Onias and this silence is often interpreted, correctly in my opinion, as a product of the temple’s relative insignificance. The temple was not erected in a central location like Alexandria or Memphis but in a backwater town and its geographical location in the periphery apparently matched its marginal role in the lives of Egyptian Jews.” On this Tropper cites Victor Tcherikover, Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews trns. S. Applebaum, (Philadelphia and Jerusalem: Jewish Publication Society of America and Magnes, 1959), pp. 277-278; M. Delcor, "Le Temple d’Onias en Égypt" Revue Biblique 75 (1968), 203; Raphael Yankelevitch, “The Temple of Onias: Law and Reality,” in Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple, Mishna and Talmud Period: Studies in Honor of Shmuel Safrani, eds. Israel Gafni, Aharon Oppenheimer and Menahem Stern (Jerusalem:Yad Ben Zvi, 1993), pp. 109-110; Wasserstein (1993) 122-123; Erich S. Gruen, "The Origins and Objectives of Onias’ Temple," Scripta Classica Israelica (1997), p. 70. Although Tropper disagrees he does mention (pp. 160f) the view of Daniel R. Schwartz, “The Jews of Egypt between the Temple of Onias, the Temple of Jerusalem and Heaven,” Zion 62 (1997) pp. 5-22 in Hebrew, Daniel R. Schwartz has challenged this approach, however, arguing that Leontopolis was not nearly as remote as scholars have thought and if so, one might conclude that Onias’s temple was more significant than previously imagined. Furthermore, the fact that the Romans shut down the temple might imply that they viewed the temple as a potential flashpoint for revolutionary activity and this Roman fear would reinforce the notion that the temple was not merely a local affair. Schwartz’s evidence for the importance of Leontopolis, however, is modest and Josephus never links the Leontopolis temple to revolutionary activity. Indeed, closing down the temple may have been prompted more by Flavian propaganda and hostility to the Jews and less by any actual threat posed by the Onias temple. Moreover, there are other reasons which make it very difficult to imagine that Onias’s temple could have ever garnered widespread support. The biblical call to limit the sacrificial cult to a single location, i.e. Jerusalem, undermined the legitimacy of all other sites. The admiration of the Jerusalem temple in Judaean-Alexandrian literature and the importance of pilgrimages to the Jerusalem temple for the Jews of Egypt make it even more unlikely that great numbers of Egyptian Jews would have supported and patronized the temple in Leontopolis.”
Genizeh. Relating this story of Onias and his brother priest to the prohibitions of Exodus 28:43 and Deuteronomy 22:5, Tropper argues (pp. 165-6)),

In order to appreciate why Simeon’s plot met with such resounding success it is worth considering how Onias’s inappropriate attire would have struck ancient priests and rabbis. From a biblical and halakhic perspective, all officiating priests had to be properly attired in priestly vestments when officiating in the sanctuary as Exodus 28:43 explicitly legislates: “They shall be worn by Aaron and his sons when they enter the Tent of Meeting or when they approach the altar to officiate in the sanctuary, so that they do not incur punishment and die. It shall be a law for all time for him and for his offspring to come.” In a similar vein, the Bible calls upon officiating priests to cover their naked bodies and the short gown, the “’ungelah” was apparently a rather revealing undergarment “in which it was unbecoming to appear in public.” Moreover, the girdle was not only an immodest garment, it was also a woman’s garment. Deuteronomy 22, 5 explicitly forbids cross-dressing and beyond this legal ramification of Onias’s feminine dress, the irreverence and immodesty it displayed would have exacerbated the affront in the eyes of the traditional religious leadership.

Significantly a poem about the Akkadian plague god Erra known from a eighth century BCE epos, speaks of cult performer’s (kurgaarrû) (and) assinnus "whom Ištar had changed from men into women to show the people piety". The assinnu are believed to have functioned mainly in the cult of Ištar, singing specific songs and dressed in distinctive garments as already mentioned. According to the University of Chicago Assyrian Dictionary, there is no evidence that they were eunuchs or homosexuals: "the Era passage may mean simply that Ištar turned his interest from the masculine role to the feminine role." Since at least thirty six copies of this poem have been recovered from five first millennium sites ranging from Ur in the south to Sultantepe north of biblical Harran it must have been important to Babylonian culture. Could the behaviour described of Onias and his older brother in the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds have had some syncretic connection to this ancient Mesopotamian rite associated with healing and war, perhaps as also adopted in the cult of Artemis? The cult of Artemis and the Essenes was already known in the Athens of that era. Could a similar knowledge and influence have also reached Jerusalem in the second century BCE?

49 Ibid. CAD pp. 341f. See also assinūtu refering to the position of the assinnu.
50 Burkert, Walter. The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influences on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age, 1992, p. 108ff. Walter Burkett has noted the consonance of the Erra's myth of seven Sebetti with the Hellenistic Seven against Thebes. Seemingly based in the Bronze Age generation before the Trojan War, the Seven Against Thebes was the third play in an Oedipus-themed trilogy produced by Aeschylus in 467 BCE.
The nature of the celibate and also married Essenes might also fit into this discourse. Lambert (p.135) argued that "[I]t is certain that [all] prostitution was regarded as a sacrament of Inanna/Ishtar." Ackerman notes Nissinen's insistence "that the assinnu(m) should be described as asexual rather than eroticized in character, a eunuchlike individual who in the words of one text, typically "fails to achieve a sexual climax during intercourse."

This, as Nissinen also writes, is hardly Enkidu's "emphasized masculinity." Enkidu and Gilgamesh are portrayed as brothers and Ackerman argues that it was illegal for equal males to have intercourse with each other. It is difficult to discern how this might have exactly related to the role of the assinnū in the cult of Ishtar itself but perhaps there is an underlying military code of comraderie and loyalty at play here. There is a similar ambiguity in the Talmudic accounts of the behaviour of the sons of Onias in the Talmud as was cited above which may also have had little to do with such erotic implications but certainly evoked related controversy.

In terms of the religious piety, Zsolnay notes that the assinnū were catalogued with mantic professionals such as prophets (āpilumāpiltum, muḥyū/maḥūtum), professional mourners (lallaru), and frenzied people (zabbu). They were also listed with other cultic functionaries, such as singers, the chief lamentation priest (kalamāh), and the simple lamentation priest (munambu), in addition to various other female and male clergy. If the etymology here suggested of Jewish Essenes being related to this term is correct, Josephus’ descriptions of the Essenes may be of some resonance in discerning these matters if the Jewish traditions were not too distorted by time, Hellenistic culture and the unique features of Jewish religion itself. Certainly the prophetic function is attested.

In Jewish War 1.(78-80), Josephus speaks of a certain Judas the Essene who had never before failed or deceived men in prophetic predictions (καὶ Ἰούδαν Ἐσσαῖος ἦν γένος οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτε πταίσας ἢ ψευσθεὶς ἐν τοῖς προαπαγγέλμασιν):

Now, this man saw Antigonus as he was passing along by the temple, and cried out to his acquaintance, (they were not a few who attended upon him as his scholars,) "O strange!" said he, "it is good for me to die now, since truth is dead before me, and something that I have foretold has proved false; for this Antigonus is this day alive, who ought to have died this day; and the place where he ought to be slain, according to that fatal decree, was Strato’s Tower, which is at the distance of seventy-five miles from this place, and yet four hours of this day are over already; which point of time renders the prediction impossible to be fill filled.” And, when the old man had said this, he was dejected in his mind, and so continued. But, in a little time news came that Antigonus was slain in a subterranean place, which was itself also called Strato’s Tower, by the same name with that Caesarea which was by the seaside; and this ambiguity it was which caused the prophet’s disorder.

51 For example, Erimhuš III 172ff lu2an.sal (var. adds .la) = as-sin-nu (var. i-[sin-nu]) with muḥyū, zabbu, kurgarru; but also Malku I 134ff. ug-bab-tum = en-tum, as-sinna-tum(!)
Later in *Antiquities* (15.373-78) Josephus speaks of another Essene, Menahem, with prophetic powers who had had a profound impact on the later relations of the Essenes with King Herod:

Now there was one of these Essenes, whose name was Manahem, who had this testimony, that he not only conducted his life after an excellent manner, but had the foreknowledge of future events given him by God also. This man once saw Herod when he was a child, and going to school, and greeted him as king of the Jews; but he, thinking that either he did not know him, or that he was in jest, put him in mind that he was but a private man; but Manahem smiled to himself, and clapped him on the back with his hand, and said, ``However that be, you will be king, and will begin your reign happily, for God finds you worthy of it. And do remember the blows that Manahem has given you, as being a signal of the change of your fortune; and truly this will be the best reasoning for you, that you love justice [toward men], and piety toward God, and clemency toward your citizens; yet do I know how your whole conduct will be, that you will not be such a one, for you will excel all men in happiness, and obtain an everlasting reputation, but will forget piety and righteousness; and these crimes will not be concealed from God at the conclusion of your life, when you will find that he will be mindful of them, and punish you for them." Now at that time Herod did not at all attend to what Manahem said, as having no hopes of such advancement; but a little afterward, when he was so fortunate as to be advanced to the dignity of king, and was in the height of his dominion, he sent for Manahem, and asked him how long he should reign. Manahem did not tell him the full length of his reign; therefore, upon that silence of his, he asked him further, whether he should reign ten years or not? He replied, ``Yes, twenty, nay, thirty years;" but did not assign the just determinate limit of his reign. Herod was satisfied with these replies, and gave Manahem his hand, and dismissed him; and from that time he continued to honour all the Essenes.

The observations of Lightfoot and the Ephesians as described in Acts may find a resonance here. Although the distances of time and culture may well be too great, Martii Nissen compares the wounding of the prophets of Baal in 1 Kings 18 to a feature of the prophetic image found in Middle Babylonian "Righteous Sufferer" text found at Ugarit. This text mentions several kinds of divination, comparing people who "bathe in their blood" to prophets (maḫḫû). Nissen compares this to the assīnnu of Mari and the Assyrian temples of Ishtar. Zsolnay, however, is sceptical of the frenzied dimension having been applied to the assīnnu. That biblical prophets had connections with military activity however goes back to the time of Moses. In terms of the Essenes, in *Jewish War* 2.567 and 3.11, Josephus speaks of John the Essene who was a military general sent to the toparchy of Thamna.

---


53 See for example, Exodus 17.9-16, Moses said to Joshua, "Choose some men for us and go out, fight with Amalek. Tomorrow I will stand on the top of the hill with the staff of God in my hand." So Joshua did as
Zsolnay suggests (p. 87) that the heroic and splendid quality of the *assinnu* (šağ.ur.sağ) is emphasized already in the ancient Sumerian contest text of the Debate between Ewe and Grain. In this playful contest text, Ewe and Grain dispute over who is superior (Ewe or Grain). In one heated segment, Grain makes reference to the warrior (ur-sağ-ra) as she cries to her rival:

"Sister, I am your better; I take precedence over you. I am the glory of the lights of the Land. I grant my power to the sağursağ [assinnu]—he fills the palace with awe and people spread his fame to the borders of the Land. I am the gift of the Anuna gods. I am central to all princes. After I have conferred my power on the warrior [ur-sağ-ra], when he goes to war he knows no fear, he knows no faltering (?)—I make him leave … as if to the playing field. (ETCSL 5.3.2:71–82)

Later in the text, continuing to emphasize her point, Grain proclaims:

"I stand up as an equal to Iškur. I am Grain, I am born for the warrior [ur-sağ-ra]—I do not give up." (ETCSL 5.3.2:140.)

Already in this early Summerian text a connection between nature and military poweress can be observed. Could there be a connection here with the nature connections described of the Jewish Essenes? Military connections can also be seen with other Ancient Near Eastern temples although Istar was a prominent one and is known to have been directly connected with the *assinnu.*

54 For military associations *isinnu* is used in ancient Assyrian phrases such as, 'battle is a feast for her (Ishtar),' 'battle and struggle are a feast for us,' to go to war is a 'festival for young men'. The *assinnu* are said to have functioned mainly in the cult of Ištar, and to have sung

___

*Moses told him, and fought with Amalek, while Moses, Aaron, and Hur went up to the top of the hill. Whenever Moses held up his hand, Israel prevailed; and whenever he lowered his hand, Amalek prevailed. But Moses’ hands grew weary; so they took a stone and put it under him, and he sat on it. Aaron and Hur held up his hands, one on one side, and the other on the other side; so his hands were steady until the sun set. And Joshua defeated Amalek and his people with the sword. Then the LORD said to Moses, "Write this as a reminder in a book and recite it in the hearing of Joshua: I will utterly blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven." And Moses built an altar and called it, The LORD is my banner. He said, "A hand upon the banner of the LORD will have war with Amalek from generation to generation."*

54 For example Michael G. Kozuh, in his *The Sacrificial Economy: On the Management of Sacrificial Sheep and Goats at the Neo-Babylonian/Achaemenid Eanna Temple of Uruk (c. 625-520 BC)*, University of Chicago doctoral dissertation, 2006, pp. 2008-39, devotes a whole chapter to the goddess Eanna and what he calls the 'bow obligation'. This will be discussed further below.
specific songs dressing in distinctive garments.\textsuperscript{55} Since Ishtar was the goddess of war as well as fertility, love and sex, the phrases equating battle with a feast to her also enhance the military connection. Zsolnay argues that the military connection at Mari can be seen with the association of the \textit{assinnû} in the related cult of Annunîtum.

The chief deity of Sippar-Amnanum was also Annunîtum, a compound name of Inanna with a war-like aspect of Ishtar favoured by the Akkadians. During the Old Babylonian period, \textit{assinnû} were associated with the temple of Annunîtum at Mari as has been mentioned, however this connection with \textit{assinnû} appears likely to have lasted much longer. The goddess Annunîtum was a hypostasis of the goddess Inana/Ištar and there are accounts the \textit{assinnû} prophesied for her.\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{55} A. Leo Oppenheim, et. al (eds.), \textit{The Assyrian Dictionary}, Vol. 1 A Part II Chicago:Oriental Institute, 1968, p. 341. "There is no specific evidence that he was a eunuch or a homosexual". Paul - Alain Beaulieu, \textit{The Pantheon of Uruk during the Neo-Babylonian Period}. Brill, Styx, 2003, p. 79 stated,

There is at present no evidence that religious festivals were performed in which Ištar and Marduk replicated at Uruk the ritual acts described in the Divine Love Lyrics for Babylon. The ritual \textit{Lku 51} mentions the god Bel in a broken passage from which little can be inferred (Appendix 2). NCBT 377, on the other hand, records allocations of sacred garments for the \textit{bīt-hilṣi} of Nabû and Nanaya on the 2nd day of the month Abu (§4.2.3.1), hinting at the existence of rituals involving the two deities. These rituals followed the clothing ceremony of the 1st day of that month, and also fell within a week-long string of cultic activities relating to the death and burial of Dumuzi. The form of Nabû mentioned in this text was presumably the god Nabu of Uruk worshiped in one of the \textit{ekur rātu}, but one should not exclude the possibility that Nabû of Borsippa came down from his home city to take part in this ritual. YOS 7, 20 indicates that certain gods of Babylon and Borsippa may occasionally have traveled to Uruk to participate in religious festivals (§ 4.5.7.3). This even raises the possibility that the symbols of Bel and Nabû worshiped in the Eanna temple acted as numinous surrogates guarding the cultic socles of Marduk of Babylon and Nabû of Borsippa which these two gods occupied when they came down to Uruk on ritual visits, but there is at present no direct evidence to substantiate this.

Further (p. 165) he states, in his translation of YOS 7, 79 line 7, "The milk may have been used in connection with the \textit{rasinin[tu} prebend, which involved the soaking of flour in milk to prepare dough." On this he cites Bottero, 1995, pp. 65 and 214. Beaulieu states, "Offerings of milk to Ištar are mentioned in \textit{Records from Erech, Time of Cyrus and Cambyses} (538-521 B.C.), by Arch Tremayne. Yale Oriental Series, Babylonian Texts, vol. 7. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1925., 79, which records the attribution of the prebend of “dairymen” (\textit{mār-rē'uṭ šizbi}) connected with the offerings of milk for the sacred meal of the Lady-of-Uruk. ” Beaulieu cites the edition and discussion of M., San Nicolo, “Parerga Babylonica VI-VIII f ArOr 4, pp. 325-348.

\textsuperscript{56} According to Zsolnay "The Misconstrued Role of the Assistinu" (p. 83, n. 6), "..."compared with other forms of divination the cuneiform prophecy corpus is quite small and exceedingly delineated. Approximately thirty-five letters discovered at Mari record one or two prophecies each (an additional 15–20 tablets recount dreams or visions). These tablets date to the Old Babylonian period and from the reigns of the Amorite rulers Yaḫdun-Lim (late nineteenth century), his son Zimri-Lim, and the interregnum of Šāmši-Addu’s son Yasmāḫ-Addu (ca. 1792–1775 B.C.E.). Also dating to the Old Babylonian period are two tablets discovered at Ešnunna that seem to contain prophecies. A further eleven tablets, containing thirty prophecies (four of which contain “collections” and seven of which contain “fresh reports”), were discovered at Nineveh (modern Mosul). Though these Ninevite prophecies record revelations from the reigns of both Esarhaddon (680–669 B.C.E.) and his son Ashurbanipal (668–631 B.C.E.), the tablets themselves date to the reign of Ashurbanipal."
Zsolnay further elaborates: 57

Similar to the Debate between Ewe and Grain, in the Old Babylonian version of the Sumerian hymn Uru-Amirabi, the assinnu receives not merely the power vital for acts of valor, but the actual art of being a hero. In this hymn, the goddess Inana (Ištar) is said to bring back multiple elements from the steppe. Among other items, she brings back heroism (nam-ursaḡ) for the saḡursaḡ (called assinnu in the later bilingual version) [VAT 1339 = VAS 2 29]. Uru-Amirabi is also pertinent to this discussion because of its mention of the kurĝara (kurğara) and the kalu (gala), two figures with whom assinnu become associated and, at times, conflated. The text relays that after bringing heroism to the assinnu, Inana brings two types of weapons, the patru (ḡiri2) and the pattaru (ba-da-ra), for the kurĝara, and the xx (broken) for the kalu. These deliveries are also recorded in the Sumerian tale Inana and Ebiḫ. After subjugating the mountain Ebiḫ for its arrogance, and claiming to have created a firm foundation for rule, Inana states [ ETCSL 1.3.2:171–175]: “I have given the kur-ḡar-ra (kurĝara) a ḡiri2 (patru) and ba-da-ra (pattaru); I have given the gala (kalu) ub and lilis drums.” Finally, in the infamous “sacred marriage” text Iddin-Dagan A, a hymn dedicated to Ninsi’ana (a deity who was, at this point, equated with Ištar’s manifestation as Venus) and nominally written for the Old Babylonian king Iddin-Dagan (ca. 1974–1954 b.c.e.), assinnu and kurgarru are said to parade with a variety of individuals.

Michael G. Kozuh, in his 2006 University of Chicago doctoral dissertation, *The Sacrificial Economy: On the Management of Sacrificial Sheep and Goats at the Neo-Babylonian/Achaemenid Eanna Temple of Uruk (c. 625-520 BC)*, devotes a whole chapter to the goddess Eanna temple and what he calls the 'bow obligation' which provides further evidence of a military connection to the feminine deity temples of the Ancient Near East in the first millennia BCE. 58 Although his study extends only to the time of Cyrus the Persian, this gives insight to the realities at the beginning of second Temple Judaism.

---


58 Kozuh begins by noting the challenges of interpretation, including discerning the meaning of Sumerian terminology:

A significant number of texts from the Eanna archive link the herdsmen and herd supervisors to the fulfillment of a particular royal service obligation, which is commonly called the “bow service.” In fact, with the exception of the ambiguously labeled “oblates,” the herdsmen are the only Eanna dependents associated with the bow obligation. This is emphasized by the stock phrase

---
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There are military connections with the Qumran area dating back to the time of King David and also to the Maccabees. King David hid out in the caves of this area when king Saul was seeking to kill him. The original structure of Khirbet Qumran is believed to have been a fort as has been mentioned, it may well have had continuing functions in this military capacity. In the times leading up to the Maccabean war there are Talmudic accounts of a conflict within the Zadokite priesthood over high priestly dress that could possibly relate to the assinnu as has already been discussed above.

Steve Mason has been very sceptical of the relationship between Qumran, the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Essenes based on Josephus' accounts of them. However a statement he makes about comparisons between the Essenes and the Roman legions in Josephus might suggest alternatively a possible military connection with the role of the Artemis cult possibly dating back to the Seleucids and even earlier. Mason states,

The Qumran-Essene hypothesis relies in large part on supposed parallels between the customs attributed to the Essenes by Josephus and those described in the scrolls. But a careful review of both sides betrays a big difference in both tone and substance. Josephus’s Essenes are characterized by exceptional order, discipline and obedience in dress, deportment, meals (held in “shiver-inducing silence”) and other areas of life. He begins by observing that the Essenes “certainly are renowned for cultivating seriousness (or solemnity, gravitas).” He uses the same word for the Essene “order” (tagma) that he otherwise uses for the Roman legions, stressing throughout his account the Essenes’ endurance, courage, self-control and manly virtue.59

Many might think that Josephus had no intention of implying that the Essenes were in any way a military group. However this may be neglectful of Josephus apologetic purpose and

---

theological intentions. The question might well be asked: Why was Josephus using terminology for the Essenes that he also used for the Roman legions? What if Josephus’ audience already knew there was a military connection to the Essenes? As noted by Stephen Goranson and others, in writing about the Essenes, ancient authors such as Pliny give "no evidence of information after the First Revolt."60 Could public perceptions of the Essenes have changed radically subsequent to the Jewish War? Thus perhaps there was an initial *naïveté* about a military dimension to the Essenes that may well have existed among pagan authors prior to the Jewish war. The examples and language of Greek philosophy as well as comparisons to how Josephus describes the Roman legions may thus further indicate that the ancient Romans of the first century post 70 CE actually knew a great deal about military involvements of the Essenes of which we no longer have the full evidence and that this ancient involvement in fact explains quite clearly Josephus' Jewish perspective on this matter. The discovery of Roman arrows in the archaeological ruins of Qumran may possibly have had as much to do with the Essenes as with the Jewish rebels and the zealots.

During the first millennia BCE time period, the biblical prophets ranged from priests in the temple such as Isaiah to the shepherd Amos. During the Hellenistic period by the second century BCE there developed an emphatic prevailing syncretism between the Seleucids and the temple in Jerusalem and their temples in Mesopotamia and Asia Minor. Scholarship has tended to view this as a Greek phenomenon but this is to overlook the influence of the Ancient Near East on the Seleucids. It can be seen that there were already long established patterns of syncretism. Stephanie Lynn Budin has looked at the earlier phenomenon of Ashtart and syncretism at Ugarit in relation to Ishtar in her important "A Reconsideration of the Aphrodite-Ashtart Syncretism". She states,

By the time Ashtart’s cult arrived on the Mediterranean coast, specifically in the texts from Ugarit, the goddess was clearly feminine distinct from her fellow deity Athtar, but still understood to be a western equivalent" of Ishtar—the RS 20.24 document mentioned above lists dištariš-tar = [‘]trt; Ishtar equals Ashtart. Like her progenitress,Ashtart maintained a belligerent persona in the Ugaritic literature, appearing in the myths as a huntress (Athtart the Huntress) and a supporter of the storm god Baal (Baal Cycle). Possibly through contact with the maiden warrior goddess

Anat, however, Ashtart lost almost all of Ishtar’s erotic components. While a beautiful goddess (The Epic of Kirta), and possibly a love interest for Baal (Ahtart the Huntress), she nevertheless does not manifest or revel in her own sexuality, as do both Ishtar and Sumerian Inanna. From a Greek perspective, Ashtart is more like Athena or Artemis than Aphrodite.  

Bodil Hjerrild has noted that the important Greek goddess Artemis is found among the Lycian and Lydian gods as Ertemis and Artimís, and the fusion of the Greek goddess with those of Asia Minor is reflected in the idol of the Ephesian Artemis. She is also identified with Cybele or Kubaba, the great goddess of Asia Minor, and with Anāhitā, an ancient Iranian goddess who came to play a significant role in the Zoroastrian religion.

The conquests of Alexander the Great brought new dimensions to the processes of syncretism that were already influenced by the Persian conquest of Asia Minor two centuries earlier. Originally a counterpart to the Sumerian Inanna, Ishtar was also a cognate for the Northwest Semitic Aramean goddess Astarte. The possibility of syncretic importation into the Ephesus cult of Artemis and also into Judaism was certainly a probability under the Seleucids given the affinities with Ishtar and the military elsewhere, and also especially given Onias' pre-Maccabean War attempts to reconcile with the Seleucids and his shelter in the sanctuary of Apollo and Artemis at Daphne during the events leading up to the Maccabean war.

As has been discussed above, there may also have been a connection with the Essenes and the name of a class of priests in the cult of Artemis whose connection to the Akkadian terms isinmu and assinu has until now been little explored. However that there were syncretic relationships between the various temples under the Seleucids is clear. Although the exact nature of their relations with the Oniads is not fully established, significantly in the events leading up to the Maccabean war, the

---


62 Bodil Hjerrild, "Near Eastern Equivalents to Artemis," IN Tobias Fischer-Hansen and Birte Poulsen (eds.), From Artemis to Diana - The Goddess of Man and Beast (University of Copenhagen:Museum Tusculanum Press, 2009), p. 42. Hjerrild suggests that in Asia Minor Artemis was juxtaposed with the mother goddess under different names including Cyblele or Ishtar and states that the Greeks adopted the mother goddess from the Phrygian pantheon as early as the 7th century. With regards to Anāhitā, Hjerrild notes the religious syncretism of Asia Minor and states concerning the military aspect (p. 46) "warriors pray to her in order to be victorious in battle and defeat their enemies"...

63 2 Maccabees 4:33 ἃ καί σαφῶς ἐπεγνωκὼς ὁ Ονιας ἀπήλεγεν ἀποκεχωρηκός ἐπὶ Δάφνης τῆς πρὸς Αντιόχειαν κειμένης

jim.collins@utoronto.ca
Zadokite high priest of Jerusalem, Onias III, according to 2 Maccabees 4:33, sought refuge (ἄσυλος) in Daphne outside of Antioch.\(^\text{64}\)

When Onias became fully aware of these acts, he publicly exposed them, having first withdrawn to a place of sanctuary at Daphne near Antioch.

According to the ancient Greek historians, connections between Apollo, Artemis and military exploits went back at least to the time of Cyrus the younger and the Persian War when king Croesus was defeated in 595 BCE. Herodotus describes how the sixth century BCE Lydian king Croesus had misinterpreted an oracle of Apollo from Delphi (Histories 1.86.1-2)

The Persians gained Sardis and took Croesus prisoner. Croesus had ruled fourteen years and been besieged fourteen days. Fulfilling the oracle, he had destroyed his own great empire. The Persians took him and brought him to Cyrus, who erected a pyre and mounted Croesus atop it, bound in chains, with twice seven sons of the Lydians beside him. Cyrus may have intended to sacrifice him as a victory-offering to some god, or he may have wished to fulfill a vow, or perhaps he had heard that Croesus was pious and put him atop the pyre to find out if some divinity would deliver him from being burned alive.

Herodotus tells us that Cyrus observed that Apollo saved Croesus. Another historian Cteias tells us in his Persica (excerpted from Photius) that Croesus had first sought refuge in the temple of Apollo

After the city was taken Croesus fled for refuge to the temple of Apollo; he was three times put in chains, and three times loosed invisibly from his bonds, although the temple was shut and sealed, and Oebaras was on guard. Those who had been prisoners with Croesus had their heads cut off, on suspicion of having conspired to release him. He was subsequently taken to the palace and bound more securely, but was again loosed by thunder and lightning sent from heaven. Finally Cyrus, against his will, set him free, treated him kindly from that

\(^{64}\) See for example, H.W. Parke, The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor London, Sydney, Dover, New Hampshire: Croom Helm, 1985, who speaks, (p. 64) about the efforts of Antiochus IV to restore influence in Miletus near the cult of Apollo at Didyma. Although Parke discusses (p. 88) the authority of Apollo in such matters as ‘the period before 250 A.D.’ as described by Prophry in Apollo at Branchidae and Aelian in Nature of Living Creatures (24) it is clear that there are much earlier roots. He speaks (p. 204) of decree of Iasos honouring Antiochos III which cites an oracle of Apollo urging concord (homonoeia - ομονοία) on Iasos see Charles Michel, Recueil d'inscriptions grecque, Bruxelles: p. 346, No. 467 - Edward Hicks 174, Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum, 442; Joseph Eddy Fontenrose, Didyma: Apollo's Oracle, Cult, and Companions, University of California Press, 1988. who notes (p. 118) that Apollo Didymeus received sacrifices in the city of Miletus at several small altars, as well as at Iasos and Carian Mylasa. According to Jon D. Mikalson, Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars University of North Carolina Press, 2003, p. 121, the account in Herodotus of the war of the Greeks against the Persian king Darius makes clear that Apollo was the major Greek god of the war for the Greeks.
time, and bestowed upon him a large city near Ecbatana, named Barene, in which there were 5000 horsemen and 10,000 peltasts, javelin-throwers, and archers.\textsuperscript{65}

Since Apollo also controlled the affairs of his sister Artemis these connections are not insignificant to our examination of a possible Essene assinну connection.

The Roman historian Tacitus tells us (\textit{Annals} 3.63) of the testimonies of delegates from a variety of Asia Minor cities to the Roman Senate in 27 CE who were justifying rites of asylum and described a variety of dedications to Apollo or Diana (the Roman equivalent of Artemis), including Miletus which traced its foundation as an asylum under Apollo to the Persian King Darius.\textsuperscript{66}

Daphne, located about 8 km from Antioch, was generally considered a place of sanctuary and according to Strabo's \textit{Geography} (16.2.6) Artemis was also equated with Diana:

\begin{quote}
Daphne, a town of moderate size, is situated above Antioch at the distance of 40 stadia. Here is a large forest, with a thick covert of shade and springs of water flowing through it. In the midst of the forest is a sacred grove, which is a sanctuary, and a temple of Apollo and Diana. It is the custom for the inhabitants of Antioch and the neighbouring people to assemble here to celebrate public festivals. The forest is 80 stadia in circumference.\textsuperscript{67}
\end{quote}

Here as Jonathan Goldstein once noted, it is significant that in 2 Maccabees there was no attempt to assure readers that Onias' place of sanctuary was not the pagan Apollo temple, especially considering how well known the Sanctuary of Apollo was.\textsuperscript{68} Goldstein compared this to Josephus' statements about Herod and his visit to an Egyptian temple in \textit{Jewish War} 1.277

\begin{quote}
So when Herod had found that the Arabians were his enemies, and this for those very reasons where he hoped they would have been the most friendly, and had given them such an answer as his passion suggested, he returned back and went for Egypt. Now he lodged the first evening at one of the temples of that country, in order to meet with those whom he left behind;
\end{quote}

and in Antiquities 14.374

\begin{quote}
Hereupon he resolved to go away, and did go very prudently by the road to Egypt; and then it was that he lodged in a certain temple; for he had left a great many of his followers there.
\end{quote}

Although the actual location of Josephus' geographical references in Egypt is now uncertain, and it may actually have been possible that where Herod visited was Onias' Jewish temple

\textsuperscript{65}Translation by J.H. Freese  http://www.livius.org/ct-cz/ctesias/photius_persica.html#%A76
\textsuperscript{66}H.W. Parke, \textit{The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor} p. 19.
there rather than a pagan one. Nevertheless, the point remains that a considerable religious syncretism existed in these military exploits. This was a phenomenon that the Maccabees reacted violently against.

Either ignored or described differently by Josephus, the book of 2 Maccabees (3:1-40) describes the earlier history of how after 175 BCE, Apollonius, the Seleucid king Antiochus’ governor of Coelesyria, was informed of the wealth in the temple of Jerusalem belonging to Hyrcanus by a certain Simon who was captain of the temple and probably a son of Joseph the Tobiad. At least according to the account of 2 Maccabees, Simon had apparently quarrelled with Onias III and was seeking revenge. When Apollonius informed Antiochus about the money in Jerusalem, the king ordered his chancellor, Heliodorus, to go there to seize the funds, 400 silver talents and 200 gold. A 'divine miracle' is said to have occurred which prevented him from carrying out the order and which, according to the account in 2 Maccabees, everyone attributed to God’s intervention. This might be compared to the intervention of priests who killed Antiochus IV in Mesoptoamia according to 2 Maccabees 1:13-17.

The tradition of Greeks seeking temple funding for their military exploits had a long history. According to the Greek historian Xenophon, the temple of Artemis at Ephesus was a major source of funding in 402 BCE for the war against the Perisians fought on behalf of Cyrus the Younger. Xenophon's account (Anabasis 5.3.7-23) of these exploits was a major inspiration for the Seleucids in their own ancient near eastern battles from the time of Alexander the Great. Xenophon's account of his subsequent building of a temple to Artemis may even have served as an inspiration for the Seleucid temples to Apollo and Artemis in Antioch:

He bought some land as an offering to the goddess in a place where Apollo [via his oracle at Delphi] had instructed him. A river called the Selinous ran through the land, and in Ephesos

---

69 J.A. Goldstein, “Tales of the Tobiads”, Christianity, 55 Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults - Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty, Part 3 (Leiden, 1975), argued (page 94) concerning Josephus' use of sources, ‘First, Josephus’ only source for the events was one which Josephus, having the biases we noted above, found incredible. On the basis of his own presuppositions and aims he tried to “correct” it. Second, the Antiquities is a large work, written when Josephus turned over to his Greek secretaries to copy and restyle from existing Greek sources, reserving for himself the important tasks of translating Hebrew and Aramaic sources and revising content. Sometimes he overlooked passages which needed to be revised, as in the numerous cross-references taken over from his sources which now have nothing to refer to in Josephus’ work. The Tobiad stories contain such overlooked passages.” Given that 2 Maccabees was possibly an early attempt to reconcile with the Zadokites in Egypt by the Hasmoneans, Josephus may have wanted to avoid any implication of sympathy to this connection.

too there is a river of the same name flowing past the temple of Artemis. There are fish and shellfish in both rivers, but at Skillous there is game-hunting country too. Xenophon also used the sacred money for building an altar and a sanctuary, and thenceforth he always dedicated a tithe of the season’s produce in order to celebrate a sacrifice in honour of the goddess. All the inhabitants of Skillous and the surrounding area, men and women, used to take part in the festival. The goddess [sc. Artemis] provided those who joined in the feast with barley-flour, bread, wine, dried fruits, and a portion both of the domesticated animals sacrificed from the sacred herds and of the wild game. The latter abounded, since Xenophon’s sons and the sons of other local people went hunting specially, and anyone who wished could join in. Wild boar, antelope and stags were caught, partly on the sacred land itself, partly on Mount Pholoe. The land lies on the road from Sparta to Olympia, about twenty stades [4 km] from the temple of Zeus. In the sacred enclosure there are meadows and thickly wooded hills, good terrain for raising pigs, cattle and also horses; plenty of fodder is available for the animals of visiting celebrants too. The sanctuary is surrounded by a grove of fruit trees providing excellent fruit in all the appropriate seasons. The temple is a small-scale reproduction of the great temple of Artemis at Ephesos, and the cult-statue is as near a likeness to the golden Ephesian original as a cypress-wood image can be. A stele stands by the temple, bearing the following inscription: ‘This ground is sacred to Artemis. Let him who owns it and takes its produce make a tithe-offering every year. With the surplus let him maintain the temple. Whosoever fails in this duty shall not escape the goddess’s notice’.

After the Seleucid king Antiochus III lost to Rome, western Asia Minor especially became increasingly subject to the influence of Rome. His successor Antiochus IV was looking for temples to provide the financing that Ephesus was no longer in a position to fulfill. This had a major impact on the Jerusalem high priesthood. By the time Onias III went to Antioch personally matters were becoming even more desperate. The book of 2 Maccabees (4:1-6) states that the Jerusalem priest Simon countered Onias III’s efforts to appease Antiochus by trying to make further trouble, so that Onias III decided to go personally to Antioch to see the king in 175 B.C.E. While the Jerusalem high priest Onias was in Antioch, King Antiochus III’s son Seleucus IV (who had originally succeeded Antiochus after the father’s death c. 187 B.C.E.), was assassinated by Heliodorus. This did not bode well for the Onias III. Onias III did not return to Jerusalem but remained at the sanctuary of the Greek sun god Apollo and Artemis at Daphne near Antioch in Syria until his death as mentioned above. After his brother Jason and then later, Menelaus were made his successors by Antiochos IV, Onias III was himself assassinated in 171 B.C.E. Since Apollo was also the oracular god patron of Delphi, there already seems a possible prophetic connection in this as well.  

---

Xenophon tells us in his *Anabasis* that upon his return from the battle against Artaxerxes with Cyrus, there was an explicit financial connection with the cult of Artemis when the captives were sold (5.3.4-6)

There, also, they divided the money received from the sale of the captives. And the tithe, which they set apart for Apollo and for Artemis of the Ephesians, was distributed among the generals, each taking his portion to keep safely for the gods; and the portion that fell to Cheirisophus was given to Neon the Asinaean. As for Xenophon, he caused a votive offering to be made out of Apollo’s share of his portion and dedicated it in the treasury of the Athenians at Delphi, inscribing upon it his own name and that of Proxenus, who was killed with Clearchus; for Proxenus was his friend. The share which belonged to Artemis of the Ephesians he left behind, at the time when he was returning from Asia with Agesilaus to take part in the campaign against Boeotia, in charge of Megabyzus, the sacristan of Artemis, for the reason that his own journey seemed likely to be a dangerous one; and his instructions were that in case he should escape with his life, the money was to be returned to him, but in case any ill should befall him, Megabyzus was to cause to be made and dedicated to Artemis whatever offering he thought would please the goddess.\(^72\)

If the above *assinu* (*isinnu*) etymology is correct, Asinaean (Ἀσιναῖος) might perhaps also be an allusion by Xeonophon to the *assinu* dimension of the Old Babylonian term. Was Neon the Asinaean (Νέων ὁ Ἀσιναῖος) somehow related to the *assinu* Essenēs or at least might their name also have been eluded to here by Xeonphon? While there are of course strong geographical possibilites, the underlying etymology of Asine as a name seems also uncertain.\(^73\)


\(^73\) In personal communications Heather M. Loube suggests that in Greek, the name Asine probably means ‘unharmed’ or ‘harmless’. Possible geographic locations for Asine has a long history cf. William Smith, *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography, Vo. 1* (1854, 1872 edit.), p. 240, and most recently Loube, in her 2013 doctoral thesis, *Sanctuaries and Cults of Artemis in Post-Liberation Messene: Spartan Mimeses?* pp. 84-86 and n. 448. Loube states modern Korone (either ancient Aipeia or Pedasos) is near Messenian Asine. For Korone she states, "Five early classical Doric capitals and column drums on the acropolis hint at a ναός of Artemis Paidotrophos, Dionysos or Asklepios, all of whom were worshiped at Korone, the latter two having marble statues seen by Pausanias (4.34.6).454 The acropolis also boasts a fine spring, a feature often associated with Artemis sanctuaries"... In terms of Myth and cult she further states (p. 86), "While the term παιδοτρόφος evokes the Tithenidia festival for Artemis Korythalia in Sparta (1.22), there is no evidence for such a cult at Korone. Nonetheless, it seems safe to conclude that, in view of the meaning of the epithet, the cult of Artemis Paidotrophos at Korone had a male focus, although it may equally well have celebrated those who nourished young males, the future of the polis, whether nurses or mothers.” However Neon's youth pre-dates post-liberation Messene. Could there have been a link with Ancient Near Eastern cult practice and professions, perhaps similar to the influence of the pre-Socratics on philosophy but instead on the cult of Artemis and labelled Asine in a way similar to the development of other epithets associated with the cult?
The geographical parallelism, for example, can be seen in Strabo's Geography (8.4.1):

*The seven cities which Agamemnon promised to give to Achilles were on the Messenian Gulf and the adjacent Asinaean Gulf, so called after the Messenian Asine...*

But what was the etymology of Neon's Asine? That this was a geographic locale can logically also be seen when Xenophon tells us in Anabasis 7.2.1, Neon the Assinaean was one of five in command of the army:

*There now remained in command of the army Neon the Asinaean, Phryniscus the Achaean, Philestius the Achaean, Xanthicles the Achaean, and Timasion the Dardanian*
But the place of Asine and, relevant to our present discussion, the etymology of where its name originally came from are by no means certain. According to Homer's Iliad (2.560) Asine was one of twelve sites where battalions of the Atheians stood:

Ἑρμιόνην Ἀσίνην τε, βαθὺν κατὰ κόλπον ἔχοντας.

Nevertheless Xenophon exhibits what Michael Flower has described as a "narrative gap" regarding Neon (pp. 97ff.) which may have a lot to do with what the classical author believed was Neon's impiety towards the goddess. Significantly Xenophon has told us in the section just prior (7.1.40-41) that Neon was involved in interrupting the sacrifices in the temple which caused the renunciation of Coertadas' generalship:

As for Coeratadas, on the first day he could not get good omens from his sacrifices nor did he serve out any rations at all to the troops; on the following day the victims were standing beside the altar and Coeratadas had on his chaplet, ready for the sacrifice, when Timasion the Dardanian, Neon the Asinaean, and Cleanor the Orchomenian came up and told him not to make the offering, for he was not to be leader of the army unless he should give them provisions. So he ordered rations to be served out. When it proved, however, that his supply fell far short of amounting to a day's food for each of the soldiers, he took his victims and went away, renouncing his generalship.

Neon is the neuter of neos meaning "new", perhaps he was a new Greek connection to the transgender implications of assimnu. Given that these soldiers were fighting for the Persian Cyrus the Younger it is possible that there may well have been a syncretistic merging of religious traditions and practice. John MacGinnis, The Arrows of the Sun - Armed Forces in

---

74 Loube cites Marie Louise Nosch, "Approaches to Artemis in Bronze Age Greece" IN T. Fischer-Hansen and B. Poulsen (eds), From Artemis to Diana. The Goddess of Man and Beast (Copenhagen, 2009), pp. 21-39 at 24-6 and states in her thesis (p.3), "Artemis is first documented as a Peloponnesian deity in the Linear B tablets found at Pylos, the 'capital' of a late Bronze Age (1600-1100 BCE) kingdom which was part of the area now known as Messenia. Artemitos has a slave (PY Es 650.5), is the recipient of a product associated with a banquet or religious event (PY Un 219.5) and perhaps has a priest (PY Fn 837.5)." Loube cites (p. 194) the map from W.A. McDonald and G.R. Rapp Jr. (eds), The Minnesota Messenia Expedition (Minneapolis, 1972); 95 Fig. 6.2.

75 Pausanias. Pausanias Description of Greece with an English Translation by W.H.S. Jones, Litt.D., and H.A. Ormerod, M.A., in 4 Volumes. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd. 1918. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Paus.%202.36.5&lang=original states (2.36.5), For a time the Asinaeans defended themselves from their wall, and killed among others Lysistratus, one of the most notable men of Argos. But when the wall was lost, the citizens put their wives and children on board their vessels and abandoned their own country; the Argives, while levelling Asine to the ground and annexing its territory to their own, left the sanctuary of Apollo Pythaeus, which is still visible, and by it they buried Lysistratus. Thus other than the possibility that there was a sanctuary to Artemis associated with that of her brother Apollo, whatever archaeological evidence from the time of Neon was likely destroyed at this point. The Library of Diodorus Siculus (12.78) mentions a 419 BCE attack by Athens on the Lacedaemonians for not paying sacrifices to Apollo Pythaeus.

Sippasr in the First Millenium BC provides important evidence for how the Sun god temple at Sippur in the times leading up to this period was involved in both military production and service.  

The possibility of an underlying syncretism here is an important consideration. As Andrea Purvis noted in her thesis, "Founders and Innovators of Private Cults in Classical Greece".

Xenophon's cult to Artemis is, like Telemachus', an offshoot of a foreign cult. Although Xenophon may have made a vow under distress and danger and may have had divine orders, we do not hear of them. His dedication, like Xenocratia's, resembles a thank offering for benefits granted by the gods; like Artemidorus', it can be connected with a polis that had some political claim to the place of cult; and like Archedamus as well as Artemidorus, Phileratus, and Philius, Xenophon too is an "outsider" to the region of site of his cult.

Neon was of course also another "outsider" who Xenophon appears to have viewed as even more heterodox and whose earlier influences are likewise unknown. Xenophon seems very critical of what he seems to regard as Neons impiety.

Some of the points Jones raises concerning the Eseenes and the Dead Sea Scrolls are certainly worth re-examining in the light of more recent research and more recently published evidence. For example, Jones cited statements by Josephus about the Essenes such as, Jewish War 2.139ff. which includes verse 2.152 that provides a similar military ethos to that found in Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon:

and indeed our war with the Romans gave abundant evidence of what great souls they had in their trials, wherein, although they were tortured and distorted, burnt and torn to pieces, and went through all kinds of instruments of torment, that they might be forced either to blaspheme their legislator, or to eat what was forbidden them, yet could they not be made to do either of them, no, nor once to flatter their tormentors, or to shed a tear;

Possibly there might even have been a connection in the fact which Josephus tells us that he trained as a youth with the Essene,s, Life 1.10-12 and later he was sent as the military leader of the Jewish forces in Galilee at the beginning of the Jewish war with Rome. He tells us his training with the Essenes was in the desert but he does not say where:

and when I was about sixteen years old, I had a mind to make trim of the several sects that were among us. These sects are three:--The first is that of the Pharisees, the second that Sadducees, and the third that of the Essenes, as we have frequently told you; for I thought that by this means I might, choose the best, if I were once acquainted with them all; so I contented myself with hard fare (σκληραγωγήσας), and underwent great difficulties and went

---

through them all. Nor did I content myself with these trials only; but when I was informed that one, whose name was Banus, lived in the desert, and used no other clothing than grew upon trees, and had no other food than what grew of its own accord, and bathed himself in cold water frequently, both by night and by day, in order to preserve his chastity, I imitated him in those things, and continued with him three years. So when I had accomplished my desires, I returned back to the city, being now nineteen years old, and began to conduct myself according to the rules of the sect of the Pharisees, which is of kin to the sect of the Stoics, as the Greeks call them.

As noted by Nanno Marinatos, citing Lloyd-Jones and Burkert, there was a military training connection with the cult of Artemis, particularly in the training of young males:

‘The chief heiress of the Mistress of Animals was Artemis’, wrote Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones. Indeed, although other goddesses, notably Hera and Athena, inherited the role of the patroness of the warrior, it is mostly Artemis who remained the goddess of the wild and mistress of sacrifices, as W. Burkert has called her. Artemis is only rarely a patron goddess of cities. She is, however, a patroness of males, especially of the young, the warriors-to-be. Her sanctuaries are often located in the margins of the city where she prepares youths to become the warriors of tomorrow. 79

The Greek word tagma is used 152 times by Josephus in 149 verses. According to Liddell and Scott it can have strong military meanings including a ‘body of soldiers, division, brigade’. 80

From the time of Xenophon Anabasis in the early fourth century BCE there was a connection between Greek military exploits in Asia and the cult of Artemis at Ephesus. 81

---


II. fixed assessment or payment, Id.Oec.1349ε, CIG2562.14(Crete).
III. body of soldiers, division, brigade, X.Mem.3.1.11,PFrankf.7.5 (iii B.C.), Ph.Bel.96.48, 103.28, PRein.14.31 (ii B.C.), Plb.3.85.3, etc. b. = Lat. manipulus, Id.6.24.5 c. = Lat. legio,legation, D.H.6.42, Sr.3.3.8, Plu.Oth.12, D.C.71.9, CIG4693 (Abukir).IV. order, rank, IG14.757 (Naples); βουλευτικόν τ. CIG441165 (Cilicia); ἰππικόν τ. ib.2803 (Aphrodisias); το τ. τῶν γυμνασιάρχων POxy.1252.24 (iii a.d.); τοῦ πρώτου τ. IG441(1).81 (Epid., ia.d.); acc. τάγμα as Adv., CIG3765 (dub.), cf. IG14.748 (Naples). V.generally, arrangement, of footprints, τις ὁ τρόπος τοῦ τ.; S.Iohn.114; row of bricks, dub. in A1c.153.

2. status, φύσεως τάγμα ἔχειν Epicur.Ep1p.24U.; function, Phild.Po.5Fr.1; ἐν τ. γενόμενοι c. inf., being in a position to., PLond.2.358.7 (ii a.d.). [pg 1752]

81 I am indebted to an unpublished paper by Heather Loube examining the account of Xenophon in 5.3.6-13 in comparing the cult of Artemis at Ephesus and the one Xenophon founded at Skillous as a result of his military successes in Asia and in fulfilment of a vow to Apollo and Artemis at Ephesus.
Coins from the Seleucid era show a parallel usage of symbols such as the bee with that of Ephesus and the cult of Artemis.\textsuperscript{82}

---

\textsuperscript{82} See further below.
More recently John Kampen has related the term Essene to ἐσσηνοί, the name for the religious functionaries of the cult of Artemis. Although Vanderkam and others have questioned this association, according to Liddell and Scott this term was associated with the 'queen bee', which might perhaps have had more than a passing relation to the fertility cult aspects of the cult of Artemis as well as to Philo's description of the Jewish Essenes as 'attending to swarms of bees' in Apologia pro Iudaïs. The bee was a major symbol of the artemis cult at Ephesus.

Given the mysteries worship dimension of Apolo and Artemis, the Hellenistic Jewish romance Joseph and Aseneth, associated with Heliopolis in Egypt, includes a bee story which might also be relevant here, as part of Aseneth's conversion to Judaism. A man descends from heaven, introduces himself as chief of the angels and orders Aseneth to dress again after her dressing in sack cloth and black tunic of mourning. The man announces her acceptance with God and her marriage to Joseph. After failing to ascertain the man's name Aseneth invites the heavenly man to take food (16:1-17:3):

*And the man said to her: "Bring to me also a honeycomb of honey." And Aseneth said: "Let me send (someone), [lord], to my family inheritance in the country and I will bring you a honeycomb of honey." And the man said to her: "Go into your chamber and you will find a honeycomb of honey." And [Aseneth] went [into her chamber] and found a honeycomb of honey lying on the table; and the honeycomb was as white as snow and full of honey, and its smell was like the breath of life. And Aseneth took the honeycomb and brought (it) to him. And the man said to her: "Why did you say: 'There is no honeycomb in my house?' And behold, you have brought it to me." And Aseneth said: "I had no honeycomb of honey in my house, lord, but it happened just as you said. Surely this came out of your mouth, for it smells like myrrh." And the man stretched his hand out and placed it on her head and said: "You are blessed, Aseneth, for the secret things of God have been revealed to you; and blessed are those who lie near to the Lord God in repentance, for they will eat of this honeycomb. "The bees of the paradise of delight have made this honey, and the angels of God eat of it, and everyone who eats of it will never die." And the man stretched his right hand out and broke off a (piece) of the honeycomb and ate. And he gave with his hand [from the honeycomb] to the mouth of Aseneth. And [the man] stretched his hand out and put his finger on the edge of the honeycomb that looks to the east; and the way of (his) finger became like blood. And he stretched out his hand a second time and put his finger on the edge of the comb that looks to the north, and the way of his finger became like blood. And

---


84 Apologia pro Iudaïs (in Eusebius’ Praeparatio Evangelica 8.11.1–18), a work usually considered part of the Hypothetica. Translated by E.H. Gifford (1903), transcribed to pdf by Roger Pearse, Ipswitch, UK, 2003) pp. 170-172

85 See Meredith Warren, "A Robe like Lightning: Clothing Changes and Identification in Joseph and Aseneth" In Kristi Upson-Saia, Carly Daniel-Hughes and Alicia J. Batten, Dressing Judeans and Christians in Antiquity Farnham, Surrey and Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2014, pp. 137-54. There are other important papers in this book which will be discussed further below.
Aseneth was standing on the left and watching everything the man was doing. And bees came up from the hive of the honeycomb, and they were white as snow, and their wings were as purple and as blue [and as threads of gold]. And they had golden diadems on their heads and sharp-pointed stringers. And all the bees flew in circles round Aseneth, from her feet to her head; and other bees, as queens, took possession of Aseneth, upon the lips. And the man said to the bees: "Go, then, to your places." And they all departed from Aseneth and [all] fell to the ground and died. And the man said: "Arise, then, and go to your place." And they arose and they all departed to the court that lies by the (tower) of Aseneth. The man said to Aseneth: "Have you seen this thing?" And she said: "Yes, lord, I have seen all these things." And the man said: "So will be the words that I have spoken to you." And the man touched the honeycomb, and fire went up from the table and devoured the honeycomb. And a fragrance went out of the burning of the honeycomb and it filled the chamber.

Significantly, in his translation and commentary, Christoph Burchard noted that this 'bees episode' in Joseph and Aseneth 'has not been interpreted satisfactorily.' However a connection between the imagery of the Artemis cult, the Jewish Essenes and the Zadokite priesthood at Leontopolis in Egypt might provide scope for further investigation.

Although no Seleucid archaeological evidence has been recovered from Daphne near Antioch, according to ancient sources there was a large temenos containing a temple of Apollo and his twin sister Artemis. As pointed out by Rolf Strootman,

> It is unknown if Daphne was a sacred place already before the Hellenistic age. Lib. Or. 11.94-99 and Sozomen 5.19, claim that Seleukos Nikator had first founded the sanctuary at Daphne, but according to Malalas 204.9-16 the temple already existed when Seleukos planted a tree in front of it... 

Further Lucinda Dirven speaks of the widespread Seleucid joint worship of Apollo and Artemis and notes in her The Palmyrenes of Dura-Europos: A Study of Religious Interaction in Roman Syria,

> As the ancestors and patrons of the Seleucid kings, Apollo and Artemis fulfilled a similar role to that of Nabû and Nania for the Babylonian kings. The Seleucid kings adhered to the traditional meaning of Nabû and Nania for the royal house. In all likelihood, therefore, Strabo's interpretatio Graeca of

---


87 Rolf Strootman, The Hellenistic Royal Courts, p. 309, n. 3. Strootman attributes the references to Lucinda Dirven.
the Babylonian gods results from the analogical function of the Greek and Babylonian couple for the reigning sovereign. 88

Dirven argues that although it is likely impossible to date with certainty when this association was made and where, she thinks it likely that it originated in Babylon in the Seleucid period. Dirven cites inscriptions in Susa and Dura-Europos as well as Daphne which, "show that Artemis and Apollo were considered the founders of the Seleucid dynasty throughout the Seleucid Empire, from the reign of Antiochus III onwards." Perhaps significantly for the case of Onias coming from the Judian temple in Jerusalem, Nabû's cult in Palmyra was associated with Bel. It does not seem impossible that Onias and the Zadokite priesthood in Jerusalem we isolated from these Seleucid developments and the possibility that the Jewish name Essene had connections with the cult of Artemis and their Essenes seems very possible, especially if the name itself was originally semitic.

The dimensions of religious syncretism under the Seleucids, especially in terms of the dynamics with the various regions they ruled is an important dynamic here. While the terms isinnu and assinu are associated originally with Mesopotamia, there is evidence of military diversity throughout the empire. Very likely Judea was treated the same way as the Seleucids treated the religious traditions of Babylon. According to Matthew P. Canepa

In order to understand the Seleukids’ engagement with the religious traditions of Babylon, it is important to stress that the Seleukids did not passively replicate them unchanged. They did not identify themselves as Babylonian kings anywhere outside of the region, and within the region they made no attempt to keep the purity of Babylonian ritual forms. Engaging both Mesopotamian and Hellenic templates, the Seleukids creatively re-imagined and manipulated important sites and rituals, updating them and making them their own. Records of cult activities performed at Ezida and Esagila under the Seleukids show that they integrated Greco-Macedonian religious practices into Babylonian rituals. Texts from Uruk describe monthly offerings, “brought to the table of the statues of the kings,” in the Rēš temple of the Anu-Antum sanctuary. The Esagila temple in Babylon introduced a new Seleukid-inspired ritual protocol for the king and his sons alongside rituals for the great gods.

At the same time, late cuneiform sources demonstrate an awareness of the prestige of non-Babylonian rituals that took place in other cities and other cultural contexts across the empire. An astronomical diary from Babylon records a Greek-style victory celebration (a “pompē”) performed in honor of Antiochos IV’s victory in his first Egyptian campaign (169 BCE). Most likely relating to the festival Antiochos IV staged at Daphne in 166/65 BCE in style if not in date, it shows that while the

Seleukids maintained Babylon’s traditions, the new traditions made their presence felt in western Asia.  

The possibility that the conflicts within the Judean high priesthood were influenced and subjected to similar influences is substantiated by considerable evidence.

As mentioned above, according to 2 Maccabees 4:33, the high priest Onias had "retreated to a place of sanctuary at Daphne near Antioch" where he was eventually assassinated. Although scholars are disagreed about the date (166 or 165 BCE?) of Antiochus Epiphanes' participation in the grand procession there as part of the festival of Apollo, it is important to realize that according to Livy there was already evidence for a repetitive festival in honour of Apollo (and Artemis) at Daphne dating back to 195 BCE. The Grand Festival at Daphne with immense military and also religious significance was recounted by Polybius (Histories 31.3) in which he stated, "The number of images of the gods it is impossible to tell completely."  

---

89 Matthew P. Canepa, "Seleukid Sacred Architecture, Royal Cult and the Transformation of Iranian Culture in the Middle Iranian Period" *Iranian Studies*, 2014, pp. 4-5. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00210862.2014.947788


90 According to Goldstein, *II Maccabees* p. 114, this was in 172 BCE.

91 Rolf Strootman, *The Hellenistic Royal Courts: Court Culture, Ceremonial and Ideology in Greece, Egypt and the Near East*, 336-30 BCE (PhD dissertation; University of Utrecht 2007) pp. 309, n. 1: “The occasion for the pompê of Antiochos Epiphanes has been variously explained as either a celebration of his military successes in Egypt or the start of his anabasis to the East; varying dates have been proposed for the pompê, depending on the occasion that one prefers. For O. Mørkholm, *Antiochus IV of Syria* (Copenhagen 1966) 97-8, it was a victory parade connected with the Sixth Syrian War, a view that has been defended at greater length by J.G. Bunge, ‘Die Feiern Antiochus’ IV. Epiphanes in Daphne 166 v.Chr.’, *Chiron* 6 (1976) 53-71, who dates the festival to September/October 166. This is rejected by B. Bar-Kochva, ‘The chronology of Antiochus Epiphanes’ expedition to the eastern satrapies’, in: idem, *Judas Maccabaeus. The Jewish Struggle Against the Seleucids* (Cambridge 1989) 466-73, who argues that the pompê was a prologue to the expedition to the Upper Satrapies, and should be dated to August 165.”

92 Ibid. n. 2, "Evidence for a repetitive festival in honour of Apollo at Daphne is provided by Livy 33.48.4-6 and 33.49.6 on 195 BCE; cf. Ath. 12.540a; *OGIS* 248 l. 52-3.”

The fact that Onias chose the Egyptian Nome of the sun god Heliopolis to build his alternate Jewish temple in Leontopolis also fits this emphasis on Apollo. The name Leontopolis also resonates with the importance of lions in the mythology of Artemis and hunting in the ancient Near East. Artemis as the moon goddess also finds connections as Bodil Hjerrild further noted.

In the 2nd century BC we can detect links to the Semitic moon goddess, Nanaia, who was depicted on Bactrian coins not only with the Semitic lions, but also with traits from Anāhitā, for instance with a bundle of twigs, called baresman, in her hand. These branches were a common feature in the Zoroastrian cult and are used to this day in the Zoroastrian communities in Iran and India. On coins from Susa one also finds Nanaia dressed as Artemis in a short chiton, a short mantle, and long boots. At the same time in Asia Minor a fusion of Anāhitā and Artemis is still in progress, and those two were worshipped together in local cults as Hermitha, the goddess of health and birth. Syncretistic elements continue in the next centuries and about 175 AD Anāhitā is found in Chaldaic oracles in her capacity of mother goddess escorted by lions as an equivalent to Moon/Artemis, Life Force/Aphrodite.


Josephus and the Dead Sea Scrolls
and Wisdom/Athena and furthermore combined with the Greek three-faced Hekate entwined with serpents. They were all united in a mystery goddess who revealed herself in a figure of fire.  

The Apollo *Toxotes* (τοξότης) or *archer* of the Seleucid dynasty seems to have shared the most common features of the different sun gods in Mesopotamia and Iran. Because of his Iranian princess mother and having served fourteen years as coregent in the east with his father, it seems likely that Antiochos I was aware of the common points between Apollo and the eastern sun gods. According to Panagiotis P. Iossif and Catharine C. Lorber, the numismatic record makes a clear statement that Apollo as the divine archer or *toxotes* was introduced as the dominant deity of the Seleucid dynasty early in the reign of Antiochos I:

Choosing Apollo to become the trademark of his coinage was, beyond any doubt, a wise decision: the son of Zeus was considered as the *most Greek of all Greek gods*, to quote Winckelmann’s approach to the god. The god ... was the patron of Greek colonization in the Archaic period. This divine aspect and role may have dictated the royal choice. 

---


The assimilation of Apollo with various oriental celestial divinities is attested by numerous ancient sources. The Greek god is especially associated with Shamash, the Babylonian sun god. In a second network or religious syncretism Apollo is associated/assimilated with Nabu, one of the principal gods of the Babylonian pantheon, and Tishtrya (= Tir). This association, as well as the subsequent interaction between Greek basileia and Babylonian socio-religious traditions, is attested by the famous Akkadian Borsippa Cylinder. In Mesopotamian art, the bow is the weapon used by those deities who protect the king in battle: the god in the winged disk (Assur or Shamash), Adad and Ishtar. Significantly the goddess is depicted on a cylinder seal holding the bow and arrows the same way as Assurnasirpal.

Because of extensive links with the Babylonian Jewish community as well as the Seleucids and Jews of Antioch it seems likely that the Jewish High Priest Onias would also have been very aware of these developments.

---

96 Iossif, "ApolloToxotes and the Seleukids" pp. 250f. For the best edition of the Akkadian Borsippa Cylinder inscription, see A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White, “Aspects of Seleucid Royal Ideology: The Cylinder of Antiochus I from Borsippa.” JHS 111: 71-86. 1991, with the previous editions and bibliography. This edition must now be supplemented by H. Limet, “L’inscription d’Antiochos I a Borsippa. Un commentaire.” Transeuphratène 29: 117-31. 2005. Iossif also notes M.-J. Seux, Hymnes et prières aux dieux de Babylone et d’Assyrie. LAPO 8.Paris: Cerf. 1976. It is interesting to note here that Shamash was depicted with a star above his head on Assyrian reliefs in the same way as Apollo on coins of Antiochos IV; see Jacob-Rost 1992, 189; Iossif and Lorber 2009b, 135. Bernard 1990. For the assimilation between Apollo and Nabu, see also Ingholt, Seyrig and Starcky 1955, no. 302 (Apollo is named ‘Nabu’) and Bounni 1981, 107-12. The “Gymnasium Inscription,” a clay tablet in Greek listing the winners of athletic contests held at Babylon in 111/0, gives purely Greek names, preponderantly with theophoric elements. The most recent editor suggests that the individuals may have been Hellenized Babylonians, with the elements Dio-, Apollo-, and Artemi-representing Anu, Nabu and Nanaia, respectively, see van der Spek 2005, 406-7 n. 8 (first reference in Haussoulier 1903, 159 no. 4).

Cylinder with Ishtar BM 89769, 4.3 x 1.8 cm; Green Garnet Frankfort, 1939 Plate XXXVa. Period VIa, Dominiqu Collon, *First Impressions*, No. 773, p. 166.

The death of Antiochus IV is described in 2 Maccabees 1:13-17 as having taken place in the Temple of Nanea at the hands of the priests may have had connections to the description of the defense of the Jerusalem Temple against Heliodoros as noted above:

"When the leader reached Persia with a force that seemed irresistible, they were cut to pieces in the temple of Nanea by a deception employed by the priests of the goddess Nanea. On the pretext of intending to marry her, Antiochus came to the place together with his Friends, to secure most of its treasures as a dowry. When the priests of the temple of Nanea had set out the treasures and Antiochus had come with a few men inside the wall of the sacred precinct, they closed the temple as soon as he entered it. Opening a secret door in the ceiling, they threw stones and struck down the leader and his men; they dismembered them and cut off their heads and threw them to the people outside. Blessed in every way be our God, who has brought judgment on those who have behaved impiously."

Nanea was a goddess of Mesopotamian origin whose name was related to the Sumerian name for Ishtar, Inana. Her syncretistic cult spread far and wide throughout the ancient world, including Greece. In the Greek world, she was equated with Artemis or Aphrodite, in Egypt with Isis, and in Iran with Anahita. Of particular interest is a temple of Artemis-Nanea in Dura-Europos built in Roman times. Dedication inscriptions identify her as the chief goddess of the city, a status she also already enjoyed in Seleucid times at Susa. The role of priests from this cult in killing Antiochus Epiphanes may well have had an important

---

influence on the Jewish Essenes, especially if they were involved in Jerusalem, and in some way involved in the protection of the temple and its sacred scriptures.

Seleucid Antiochus III coin from Susa depicting bee with Hermes holding caduceus and Antiochus IV coin with bee and stag on reverse:

Ancient Greek Ephesus

Tetradrachm with Bee and Stag 390 - 130 BCE

Depictions of the bee associated with the cult of Artemis at Ephesus appear on coins of Antiochus IV from Susa can be compared to coins depicting the bee from Ephesus.
It is unclear if there was a connection between the Greek laurel which was so important in Daphne on the Orontes and the cult of Apollo and Artemis there and the myrtle or *asu* associated with incense, perfume and healing in Babylonia since Sumerian times. The word *asu* is thought to be derived from the Sumerian A.ZU (or at Mari as GIŠ.A.AZ). The Greek word *daphne* (δάφνη) is used by Josephus both for the suburb of Antioch and also as the term for laurel. For example in *Jewish War* 7.124:

> And as soon as ever it was day, Vespasian and Titus came out, crowned with laurel, and clothed in those ancient purple clothes which were proper to their family, and then went as far as Octavian's Walks;

In 7.126 Josephus makes further reference to their dress:

> Now a tribunal had been erected before the cloisters, and ivory chairs had been set upon it, when they came and sat down upon them. Whereupon the soldiers made an acclamation of joy to them immediately, and all gave them attestations of their valour; while they were themselves without their weapons, and only in their silken garments, and crowned with laurel:

Mark Anthony is described as having heard the merits of Herod at Daphne in *Antiquities* 14.325. Similarly in *Jewish War* 1.243 we are told,

> However, after this, there came a hundred of the principal men among the Jews to Daphne by Antioch to Antony, who was already in love with Cleopatra to the degree of slavery; these Jews put those men that were the most powerful, both in dignity and eloquence, foremost, and accused the brothers. But Messala opposed them, and defended the brothers, and that while Hyrcanus stood by him, on account of his relation to them.

According to 14.451 it was at Daphne that Herod was informed of his brother's death, also paralleled in *Jewish War* 1.328. In 17.24 we are told that the Roman Legate to Syria Saturnius gave a Babylonian Jew with 500 horsemen a place to live at Antioch by Daphne of Syria called Valatha. In *Jewish War* 4.3 Josephus tells us of another Daphne with a temple of the 'golden calf' near a source of the Jordan in northern Galilee.

The name *Onias* was an attempt to Hellenize the Hebrew *Honi*, (a shortened form of the Hebrew *Yohanan* meaning “John” or “Yahweh has been gracious”), the name borne by the

---

great-grandfather, father and son of Simon II. In Hellenistic circles, *Onias* (Ονίας) was apparently connected with the Greek word *onos* (ονός), meaning “ass”, which according to a popular belief, Jews worshipped.\(^{100}\) This shows the already existing second century B.C.E. apparent scepticism of members of the Hellenistic population towards at least some Jewish beliefs and religious practices. Those who were critical of the adoption of Hellenism by other leading families in Jerusalem seem nevertheless to have particularly respected at least certain Oniad high priests who proudly represented their ancestry as *sons of Zadok*.

According to the book of Ezekiel (48:8-23), in a very different schema to Joshua 13-19, the land where Qumran was located allocated to the 'prince' or 'teacher' (רבא - 'Raba') and was east of the special territory allocated by God to the Zadokite priests – who alone were worthy to make sacrifices on the altar in Jerusalem. It was also said to be where the water from the eschatological Temple would flow (Ezekiel 47:1-12). Qumran is located in the eastern most part of this special territory allocated to the 'teacher', across the Dead Sea from Mount Nebo where Moses went up to see the promised land (see Deuteronomy 34:1).

Also according to Ezekiel 48:8-11, the consecrated parcel of this Utopian map will be (v. 11) 'for the priests who are sanctified of the sons of Zadok, which have kept my charge, which went not astray when the children of Israel went astray, as the Levites went astray.' This instruction is paralleled in the Septuagint (LXX) and Targum versions of Ezekiel 48:11.101

While there is now only the above contested radiocarbon evidence that could indicate that any of the scrolls were possibly secreted in the Qumran caves as early as the Maccabean conflict, a letter at the beginning of second Maccabees states that there was an already existing tradition of hiding treasures from the Temple 'below' Mount Nebo going back to the time of Jeremiah and the exile. While Mount Nebo is actually across the Dead Sea from Qumran, the special status for this area west of the Dead Sea at the end of the Book of Ezekiel seems to provide a further sense of how an earlier tradition was continued at the time of the beginnings of the Maccabean War. If this connection is indeed true, the pottery at Qumran could have been established later to manufacture jars to protect important sacred texts secreted in the sacred caves above what is now often referred to as the 'community'. When the Hasmoneans subsequently took over the Jerusalem high priesthood, Onias had constructed (or was constructing) a competing Temple in Egypt, which then later influenced the so-called Qumran covenanters who followed the Egyptian Hebrew sources of the Septuagint or possibly adopted some of the Samaritan texts in a modified way. The Qumran caves under this scenario can be seen to have continued to be a very sacred site for hiding scrolls from the Temple and copying them at various times when the Temple was threatened until the time of the Jewish War.

The second letter of 2 Maccabees 2:1-15 may thus contain another important clue as to how the Dead Sea Scrolls came to be located in the caves towards Mount Nebo above Qumran. If so, this may be another important revised explanation, related to the theories to be developed further below, as to how originally at the time of the Maccabean War, many of the Temple scrolls from Jerusalem may have been possibly secreted in the caves at Qumran and only a few were left behind by the Hasmoneans when they restored liturgical use of the Temple in Jerusalem at the first celebration of Hannukah.

---

101 LXX: τοῖς ἱερεύσι τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις υἱοῖς Σαδδουκ τοῖς φυλάσσουσι τὰς φυλακὰς τοῦ οἴκου οἵτινες οὐκ ἐπλανήθησαν ἐν τῇ πλανήσει υἱῶν Ισραηλ ὃν τρόπον ἐπλανήθησαν οἱ Λευῖται ὃν τρόπον ἐπλανήθησαν οἱ Λευῖται. Targum Ezekiel: לְכָהֲנַיָא דְקַדִישִין מִבְנֵי צָדוֹק דִנטַרֻו מַטְרַת מֵימְרִי דְלָא טְעוֹ בְמִטעֵי בְנֵי יִשרָאֵל כְמָא דְטעוֹ לֵיוָאֵי. מַכְכָה לָדְרִישָא. j.m.collins@utoronto.ca
If the second letter of 2 Maccabees 2:1-15 may contain a clue to the origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls having been located in the caves above Qumran, perhaps not without significance, 2 Maccabees 2:1-15 describes a cave dwelling (οἶκον ἀντρώδη) where at the time of the exile the prophet Jeremiah is said to have hid the ark and altar of incense from the Temple. This passage from 2 Maccabees is the text of a letter supposedly written to the Zadokites in Egypt and might well reflect the tension between them and the Hasmoneans who had taken over the worship in the Temple in Jerusalem:

One finds in the records that the prophet Jeremiah ordered those who were being deported to take some of the fire, as has been mentioned, and that the prophet, after giving them the law, instructed those who were being deported not to forget the commandments of the Lord, or to be led astray in their thoughts on seeing the gold and silver statues and their adornment. And with other similar words he exhorted them that the law should not depart from their hearts. It was also in the same document that the prophet, having received an oracle, ordered that the tent and the ark should follow with him, and that he went out to (ἐις could also be translated 'toward' here) the mountain where Moses had gone up and had seen the inheritance of God. Jeremiah came and found a cave-dwelling, and he brought there the tent and the ark and the altar of incense; then he sealed up the entrance. Some of those who followed him came up intending to mark the way, but could not find it. When Jeremiah learned of it, he rebuked them and declared: "The place shall remain unknown until God gathers his people together again and shows his mercy. Then the Lord will disclose these things, and the glory of the Lord and the cloud will appear, as they were shown in the case of Moses, and as Solomon asked that the place should be specially consecrated." It was also made clear that being possessed of wisdom Solomon offered sacrifice for the dedication and completion of the temple. Just as Moses prayed to the Lord, and fire came down from heaven and consumed the sacrifices, so also Solomon prayed, and the fire came down and consumed the whole burnt offerings. And Moses said, "They were consumed because the sin offering had not been eaten." Likewise Solomon also kept the eight days. The same things are reported in the records and in the memoirs of Nehemiah, and also that he founded a library and collected the books about the kings and prophets, and the writings of David, and letters of kings about votive offerings. In the same way Judas also collected all the books that had been lost on account of the war that had come upon us, and they are in our possession. So if you have need of them, send people to get them for you.

Although commentators such as Goldstein, have described this simply as a 'forged letter', there is now evidence that 2 Maccabees is more historically significant than was previously thought. Could Qumran have originally been this secret hidden cave dwelling where the holiest articles from the Temple were secreted? If the scrolls from the Temple had been secreted there this could explain why a pottery operation was later established to make jars to help protect the sacred scrolls.

Although Joan E. Taylor's important study, "Buried Manuscripts and Empty Tombs: The Qumran Genizah Theory Revisited" does not project the pottery jars in the caves as earlier than Herodian times, she does look at the archaeology of how many storage jars there were and how carefully the scrolls were protected there. She notes as well that Egypt provides similar examples of burying scrolls

A close chronological parallel to the practice of placing scrolls in jars comes from Egypt, and is found for example in Deir el-Medineh, and from Egypt too is the parallel for burying manuscripts in jars in mountain caves or rocky overhangs. The Nag Hammadi codices, found in 1945, comprising thirteen Gnostic codices, were buried under a rock overhang (associated with tombs) by Coptic monks. These were placed in a jar, which was closed with a bowl-shaped lid, and sealed with bitumen. In 1952, a later library of Biblical, apocryphal and other manuscripts of the Pachomian Order was found close to the Nile in this region. The Dishna papers or Bodmer Papyri, found 12 km from Nag Hammadi, were in a jar. In none of these instances do we appear to have burial of manuscripts coinciding with a rapid hiding scenario. In fact, two of the texts from Nag Hammadi specifically refer to books being stored for preservation until the end of time in a mountain: The Gospel of the Egyptians 68: 10-69: 5 and Allogenes 68: 6-20.103

---


Taylor notes Minna Lönnqvist and Kenneth Lönnqvist, “Parallels to Be Seen: Deir el-Medina Jars Containing Manuscripts,” The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures: An International Conference Organized by the University of Vienna and the Hebrew University of Jerusalem (Vienna, February 11–14, 2008) for the Deir el-Medineh example and for the Nag Hammadi codices, James M. Robinson, ed., The Nag Hammadi Library in English, (rev. ed. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1988), 21-22. Taylor states (p. 17) "The jar itself was smashed and not recovered, but the bowl lid remains in the Coptic Museum, Cairo. James Robinson noted, after examining this: “The diameter at the outer edge is 23.3-24.0 cm., with a diameter inside the bowl of 18.2-18.7 cm., adequate to close a mouth large enough to admit the codices, whose broadest leaves, in Codex VII, measure up to 17.5 cm. There are a few black tarlike stains about 2.0 cm. from the outer edge on the under side of the rim, perhaps vestiges of a bitumen used to seal the bowl into the jar. Thus, the jar probably could not be opened readily to investigate its contents, which would explain why it was broken by its discoverers. This would also explain the excellent state of preservation of a number of the codices ...” James M. Robinson, “The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Codices,” Biblical Archaeologist 42/4 (1979): 206-224, at pp. 213-4. Taylor cites also Egyptian early Christian examples and says (p. 4), "As will be seen, this review leads me to concur that the corpus we know as the Dead Sea Scrolls includes within it a genizah (temporary store) of manuscripts yet to be buried, but overall my investigations have led to a different conclusion, namely that the Dead Sea Scrolls are the surviving, extant fraction of a huge manuscript cemetery that cannot have been quickly hidden away at one critical moment in time."
In making a case for the importance of what he considered the core of the letter in 2 Maccabees 1:10c-18a + 2:16-18, Jochen G. Bunge argued in his 1971 Bonn doctoral thesis that the whole of 2 Maccabees was a Hasmonean Jerusalem appeal to the Egyptian Jews in Leontopolis to accept the legitimacy of their Jerusalem Temple priesthood and the establishment of the festival of Hannukah. Although scholars once widely rejected the historical value of 2 Maccabees, this sceptical view has been revised in recent years and there is now important evidence for its historicity.

Goldstein used cuneiform dating from the Babylonian King List of the Hellenistic Period (BM 35603) to reject the authenticity of the 2 Maccabees letter. He stated:

Ep. 2 cannot be what it claims to be: a letter of the Jews in Jerusalem and Judaea, the Council of Elders, and Judas (Maccabaeus), sent to the Jews of Egypt (vs. 10) after the death of Antiochus IV (vss. 13-16) and before 25 Kislev, asking the Jews of Egypt to celebrate simultaneously the festival of the Purification of the Temple (vs. 8). The strange account of the death of Antiochus is not an obstacle to the authenticity of Ep. 2. The first reports of the king’s death to reach Jerusalem could well have been distorted by rumor, especially with the precedent of the death of Antiochus III (Diodorus xxviii. 3, xxix. 15; Justin xxxii. 2. 1-2). The decisive point is chronological.

Goldstein based his dating of 1 and 2 Maccabees on the text of British Museum Cuneiform Tablet BM 35603 as translated by A.J. Sachs and D.J. Wiseman. According to Goldstein,
Antiochus IV died in the vicinity of Isfahan in 164/3 B.C.E. (AB vol. 41, pp. 307-9). His death became known at Babylon in the ninth month of the Babylonian year (British Museum Cuneiform Tablet BM 35603, published in A. J. Sachs and D. J. Wiseman, “A Babylonian King List of the Hellenistic Period,” ... or between November 20 and December 18, 164. Necessarily his death became known at Jerusalem later than at Babylon. Indeed, there is evidence that the regime of Lysias at Antioch suppressed the news for weeks; see AB vol. 41, p. 43. Even discounting that evidence, the news must have taken some ten days to travel from Babylon to Jerusalem, for under favorable conditions couriers over the shorter distance from Tiberias to Pumbedita took one week...  

More recently errors have been pointed out in the translation of the text of BM 35603 by A.J. Sachs and D.J. Wiseman. Even more importantly, Dov Gera and Wayne Horowitz have noted a year earlier dating and extensive rational for the death of Antiochus IV in 163 B.C.E. based on the Babylonian Astronomical Diaries which is likely more reliable than BM 35603. This earlier dating negates Goldstein's negative assessment of the historical possibility of the letter from Jerusalem to Leontopolis in 2 Maccabees. Could it be that there was a connection between the Essenes and the Zadokites dating back to this pre-Maccabean era as well? Earlier scholarship which investigated a connection between the Essenes and the Εσσήνοι of the cult of Artemis that is worth revisiting.

108 Goldstein, 2 Maccabees p. 157 with references to his earlier Anchor Bible 41 commentary on 1 Maccabees. See also more recently John R. Bartlett, 1 Maccabees, Sheffield Academic Press, 1998, pp. 77-78.

109 See for instance Jona Lendering, Livius.org post:


Scrolls that the Hasmoneans did not approve of for various reasons may well have been left behind in the caves at Qumran and others may have been created there or left there by those who did not favour the Hasmonean or later high priesthood. However there has been wide support for an association with the Essenes since the scrolls were first discovered in the late 1940s. As Joan Taylor points out in her important article, "Philo of Alexandria on the Essenes: A Case Study on the Use of Classical Sources in Discussions of the Qumran-Essene Hypothesis",

The issue of whether the site of Kh. Qumran, on a plateau by the Dead Sea, was occupied by Essenes during the late Second Temple period continues to divide scholars. Archaeologists and historians both for and against the Qumran-Essene hypothesis appeal to the classical sources in support of their arguments, the important evidence being that of Philo of Alexandria, Josephus and Pliny the Elder.\textsuperscript{112}

Michael Owen Wise, together with Abegg and Cook (1996), his teacher Norman Golb and others argued that the once widely held theory of Essene origins – what they term the Standard Model - for the library discovered at Qumran should be reconsidered:

the idea that the Qumran group - Essenes or some other persuasion - originated in the second century B.C.E. out of opposition to the Hasmonean takeover of the high-priesthood is crumbling. The newly released scrolls offer this notion no support. In both old scrolls and new there are indeed many references to the corruption of Israel's rulers-to their rapacity, to their greed, to their complicity in the profanation of holy sites-but not a single passage objects to the high priest's line of descent. In fact, a close reading of Josephus will reveal that only the Pharisees ever objected to a Hasmonean as such holding the high-priesthood (Ant. 13.288-292). In short, the Standard Model, while an elegant idea, has become less convincing, not more, as additional evidence has come forth from archaeology and the texts.\textsuperscript{113}

It is true as Joan E. Taylor has stated in her "Philo of Alexandria on the Essenes":

Josephus states in Ant. 15.371 that the way of life practiced by the Essenes was introduced to Greece by Pythagoras, but can one extrapolate from this that Josephus thought that the Essenes were entirely identical to Pythagoreans and therefore


vegetarians, any more than one can extrapolate that the Pharisees really were Jewish Stoics on the basis of Josephus comments in *Life* 12?\textsuperscript{114}

Mason further states,

The acid test of any philosophy in antiquity was the way its believers faced death. Josephus dwells on this as the climax of his presentation of the Essenes: Contemptuous of death’s terrors, some of them underwent torture during the then-recent war with Rome. Like other Judeans, only more so, they smiled in their agonies and died cheerfully.

According to Mason,

Although these themes are widely paralleled in Greco-Roman moral and philosophical discourse, it is difficult to find striking parallels with the people described in the scrolls. For example, we can assume that all such groups with common meals insisted that people behave well. But Josephus’s Essenes achieved renown for being remarkably disciplined.

The Dead Sea Scroll known as the *Community Rule*, by contrast, seems to envisage some fairly boorish, even disgusting behavior on the part of the membership. A range of penalties, from reduced rations to expulsion, is assessed for speaking the name of God in a curse, running fraudulent financial schemes, lying down to sleep in a general meeting, practicing vigilante justice, bursting into raucous laughter, spitting into the assembled group, repeatedly walking out of a meeting, going around naked, or exposing one’s private parts through flimsy clothing.\textsuperscript{115}

\textsuperscript{114} Joan E. Taylor, “Philo of Alexandria on the Essenes: A Case Study on the Use of Classical Sources in Discussions of the Qumran-Essene Hypothesis,” *Studia Philonica Annual* 19 (2007): 4. Taylor also makes the important point of the significance of Pliny, "Fundamental in terms of making the association between the site of Qumran and the Essenes has been the evidence of Pliny. Pliny writes (Hist. Nat. 5.15, 4/73): *ab occidente litora esseni fugiunt usque qua nocent, gens sola . . . socia palmarum,;" in the west [of the Dead Sea] the Essenes flee all the way from the shores which are harmful, a type of people alone . . . in the company of palms”; *infra hos engada oppidum fuit . . . inde masada,; “below them was the town Engedi . . . from there Masada.” Taylor cautions (n. 2) that Pliny may have been wrong about the location.

\textsuperscript{115} In like vein Mason continues, "These types of behaviors would have been totally incongruent with Josephus’s portrait of the solemn and disciplined Essenes, and therefore such rules would have been unimaginable. One might reasonably object that we do not have a *Community Rule* equivalent for Josephus’s Essenes, and if we did it might bring their lofty image down a notch or two. That is true: It might. But where are those alleged close and unique parallels between Josephus’s Essenes and the scroll people?" As suggested in my note above, the laws of Leviticus are in the bibles used by modern Christian and Jewish groups but that does not mean that they have nothing to do with the behaviour of those groups. Just because everyone does not faithfully follow the ten commandments does not mean they have no impact on the groups who believe in them.
Certainly Josephus was writing an extensive assessment of a wartime situation in his account of the *Jewish War* - from the perspective of a former enemy general to the victorious Romans. However it may also be important to consider the possibility that the *Damascus Covenant* and *Community Rule* were written to provide *torah* for a developing wartime situation when the Temple was no longer considered accessible or orthodox. Military bases or armies can appear quite serene in terms of the discipline of the troops even though some of the troops may not always follow the rules of their unit at all times and may in fact have need for reprimands and disciplinary action. The fact that the Essene community appeared so serene to Roman writers such as Pliny may have had more to do with its strict rules for those who were its members. Although Josephus also describes the Essenes in terms of philosophers this may have much more to do with the interests of Josephus' audience than possible military realities of the Essene community.

An example of a perhaps similar oblique philosophical reference in Roman literature from the post 70 CE first century, it is worth considering a statement in Arrian's *Discourses of Epictetus* (1.11-12) about the plight of a man who had lost all his fortune except for a million and a half sesterces as it gives an indication of the gap between philosophers committed to a simple life of poverty and the affluent and politically powerful who comprised the leaders of Roman society and who were likely also in Josephus' audience,

"I know a certain man who clung in tears to the knees of Epaphroditus and said that he was in misery: for he had nothing left but a million and a half sesterces. What, then, did Epaphroditus do? Did he laugh at him as you are laughing? No; he only said, in a tone of amazement, "Poor man, how, then, did you manage to keep silence? How did you endure it?""\(^{116}\)

For example, after outlining the commitment of Mattathias and his sons, 1 *Maccabees* (2:29-34) speaks of those seeking righteousness and justice” perhaps in an allusion to the followers of the Zadokite Oniads:

*At that time many who were seeking righteousness and justice went down to the wilderness to live there, they with their sons, their wives, and their livestock, because troubles pressed heavily upon them. And it was reported to the king’s officers, and to the troops in Jerusalem the city of David, that those who had rejected the king’s command had gone down to the hiding places in the wilderness. Many pursued them, and overtook them; they encamped opposite them and prepared for battle against them on the Sabbath day.*

Perhaps evocative of the original formation of Qumran, 2 *Maccabees* (6:11) speaks further of

\(^{116}\) This quite apart from the question of whether or not this man mentioned by Arrian was possibly Josephus’ Epaphroditus. In modern times one might look at a religious group such as the Amish or Old Order Menonites and compare external observations with the sometimes strict Christian beliefs they follow.

**JIM COLLINS@UTORONTO.CA**
 Others who had assembled in the caves nearby, in order to observe the seventh day secretly, were betrayed to Philip [the king’s officer] and were all burned together, because their piety kept them from defending themselves, in view of their regard for that most holy day.

Still other questions worth asking relate to the pottery kilns at Qumran. Why would such a site have been chosen? There was not likely much firewood in the area nor was it evidently a good source of clay. At least a possible explanation might be that the first pottery kilns at Qumran could have been constructed to build storage jars for the scrolls secreted in the caves above. Then during the conflicts with John Hyrcanus and at the time of the decade before Quirinus and during the time leading up to the Jewish War the site was again an active focus for messianic militaristic spirituality, perhaps inspired at least in part by the earlier writings of the mid-second century Zadokites.

The “Standard Model” promoted the idea that the community at Qumran was an Essene religious community, probably monastic. In the face of such a view, the suggestion that the site was used by Zadokites may appear unlikely. However it is still unclear what the origins of the Essenes or even what the etymology of their name originally was. The Zadokites were definitely very spiritual although they also had a definite militaristic side. Perhaps there was a special intention to conceal and yet maintain the scrolls in the caves.

Supposing that the caves were originally used to hide scrolls at the beginning of the Maccabean war when the Zadokite descendants of Ezra were still in charge of the temple sacrifices, the symbolic significance of the site must have grown in importance after the Zadokite high priests were definitely excluded from Jerusalem by the Great Synagogue assembled on the 18th day of Elul 140 B.C.E., as described by 1 Maccabees (14:27-49). The beginning of the Hasmonean high priesthood was an event that would have been particularly provocative to the Oniads as already cited in the last chapter.

So they made a record on bronze tablets and put it on pillars on Mount Zion. This is a copy of what they wrote: "On the eighteenth day of Elul, in the one hundred seventy-second year, which is the third year of the great high priest Simon, in Asaramel, in the great assembly of the priests and the people and the rulers of the nation and the elders of the country, the following was proclaimed to us:

"Since wars often occurred in the country, Simon son of Mattathias, a priest of the sons of Joarib, and his brothers, exposed themselves to danger and resisted the enemies of their nation, in order that their sanctuary and the law might be preserved; and they brought great glory to their nation. Jonathan rallied the nation, became their high priest, and was gathered to his people. When their enemies decided to invade their country and lay hands on their sanctuary, then Simon rose up and fought for his nation. He spent great sums of his

117 See most recently, Jacek Michniwicz, Qumran and Jericho Pottery: A Petrographic and Chemical Provenance Study Poznan:Adam Mickiewicz University Press, 2009, especially conclusions pp. 140-142.

own money; he armed the soldiers of his nation and paid them wages. He fortified the
towns of Judea, and Beth-zur on the borders of Judea, where formerly the arms of the enemy
had been stored, and he placed there a garrison of Jews. He also fortified Joppa, which is
by the sea, and Gazara, which is on the borders of Azotus, where the enemy formerly lived.
He settled Jews there, and provided in those towns whatever was necessary for their
restoration. "The people saw Simon's faithfulness and the glory that he had resolved to win
for his nation, and they made him their leader and high priest, because he had done all
these things and because of the justice and loyalty that he had maintained toward his nation.
He sought in every way to exalt his people. In his days things prospered in his hands, so
that the Gentiles were put out of the country, as were also those in the city of David in
Jerusalem, who had built themselves a citadel from which they used to sally forth and defile
the environs of the sanctuary, doing great damage to its purity. He settled Jews in it and
fortified it for the safety of the country and of the city, and built the walls of Jerusalem
higher.
"In view of these things King Demetrius confirmed him in the high priesthood, made him
one of his Friends, and paid him high honors. For he had heard that the Jews were
addressed by the Romans as friends and allies and brothers, and that the Romans had
received the envoys of Simon with honor.
"The Jews and their priests have resolved that Simon should be their leader and high priest
forever, until a trustworthy prophet should arise, and that he should be governor over them
and that he should take charge of the sanctuary and appoint officials over its tasks and over
the country and the weapons and the strongholds, and that he should take charge of the
sanctuary,
and that he should be obeyed by all, and that all contracts in the country should be written
in his name, and that he should be clothed in purple and wear gold.
"None of the people or priests shall be permitted to nullify any of these decisions or to
oppose what he says, or to convene an assembly in the country without his permission, or to
be clothed in purple or put on a gold buckle. Whoever acts contrary to these decisions or
rejects any of them shall be liable to punishment."
All the people agreed to grant Simon the right to act in accordance with these decisions. So
Simon accepted and agreed to be high priest, to be commander and ethnarch of the Jews
and priests, and to be protector of them all. And they gave orders to inscribe this decree on
bronze tablets, to put them up in a conspicuous place in the precincts of the sanctuary, and
to deposit copies of them in the treasury, so that Simon and his sons might have them.

This event in 140 B.C.E. would undoubtedly have been deeply resented by the more zealous
Zadokites.

Perhaps Onias IV simply moved to Egypt and set up his competing Temple at Leontopolis
without a further thought or action regarding the installation of the Hasmonean high
priesthood in Jerusalem… however is it not at least possible that there was some evidence
remaining in Palestine of when the Zadokites fought with the Hasmoneans against
Antiochus Epiphanes?
Certainly some of the writings discovered in the caves at Qumran describe a community which referred to its founders as the *sons of Zadok* who were the source of a privileged exclusive torah. Their founder apparently was also called the *Teacher of Righteousness*. The fact that the Hebrew word for “righteousness” is *zedek* which springs from the same root linguistically as *Zadok* as has already been pointed out, seems a convenient connection here. The numerous references to the Teacher of Righteousness in the writings from Qumran and the qualities attributed to him indicated to Yadin that the Temple Scroll likely became the written torah of the community. Written after the apocalyptic style of the book of Daniel but apparently not a pseudepigraphal work, the Temple Scroll spans all the subjects of the religious rulings of the Pentateuch, including Deuteronomy itself from which large sections have been shown to have been related.

To look at but one attempt to open discussion of the importance of a possible Egyptian connection with Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Finnish archaeologists Minna and Kenneth Lönnqvist (2002) discussed the Tomb of Zadok according to the Copper Scroll (3Q15) and the likely possible connection to the Tomb of Jason excavated after its discovery in 1956. They also looked at the proto-history of the Qumran community in connection with Egypt, the Temple of Onias, the solar calendar and other Qumran and Dead Sea Scrolls-related matters after spending five years examining the archaeological evidence from Qumran at the Ecole Biblique in Jerusalem. Although they looked at the archaeological evidence in as comprehensive a way as possible their important work has been virtually ignored. As they themselves argued, while there have been literally thousands of articles and countless books about Qumran, only a few have had substantial archaeological substance.\(^{119}\) They argue further that while the “Dead Sea Scrolls have often been described as the most important archaeological discovery in the biblical research during the entire 20th century…” and state that they do not want to refute this conclusion, they express concern that there has been a great absence of modern professional archaeological input overall.\(^ {120}\)

Jean-Baptiste Humbert and others have brought important new archaeological evidence and analysis to the fore.\(^{121}\) With additional insights developed from archaeology more generally

\(^{119}\) On this point see also the assessment of Devorah Dimant, "Israeli Scholarship on the Qumran Community" IN Devorah Dimant, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective: A History of Research*, (2012), pp. 252-53: "Strikingly, two subjects intimately linked with the new documents [from Qumran] are conspicuously absent from early Israeli scholarship: the archaeology of Qumran and the halakhah of the Qumran texts. That no Israeli archaeological survey of Qumran took place is readily explained by the fact that the excavations there were conducted under the auspices of the Jordanian authorities. Therefore Israeli archaeologists had to rely on the results of the Qumran excavations by Roland de Vaux and on his interpretation of them."

\(^{120}\) Ibid, p. 16, n. 1: “We do therefore believe that when the evidence of the site of Qumran as a whole is taken into account, the present archaeological and historical picture will be altered as new information will be yielded. Only then can also the Scrolls make their proper contribution to the knowledge of the community which created them.”

and other areas of more recent scholarship a broad new overview of Zadok and Leontopolis in relation to Josephus and the Dead Sea Scrolls is becoming possible that is very much worth exploring further.

As cited above, Josephus' account at the beginning of *Antiquities* 18 concerns Judas the Galilean, who is said to have acted with Zadok a Pharisee. Although scribal and interpretational uncertainties have obscured the meaning and importance of this statement, a reassessment of this passage yields implications which raise possible new insights into the account of Jesus' birth in the Luke's Gospel as well as to passages in the Talmud and other Jewish literature about the 'House of Onias' which have a wide impact that may even help clarify some aspects of the origins of Rabbinic Judaism and the *Amidah*. As in the Gospel story, however, these beginnings are first described in relation to the prophecies of Isaiah. In the Gospel story we are told that Isaiah spoke of a young mother bearing a child which she then took to Egypt. For Josephus the story begins with a prophecy from Isaiah 19 about the Lord building an altar near a 'city of the sun' elsewhere interpreted as the 'city of desolation' in Egypt.

It is an often overlooked fact that the first century Jewish historian Flavius Josephus both starts and ends his account of the *Jewish War* which describes the historical events leading to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE by referring to this Jewish Zadokite altar and temple in the Egyptian nome of Helipolis. It was founded after a Zadokite high priest named Onias was displaced from the Jerusalem temple in the events before the Maccabean war (167-160 BCE). Although Heliopolis in Greek meant the City of the Sun and was related to the city of On in the Hebrew bible, later tradition interpreted the Hebrew as 'City of Desolation'. Since the Maccabean War had been fought over the issue of the Abomination that makes desolate, this attribution is especially significant.

Josephus mentions a prophecy from Isaiah as important to the founding of Onias' Egyptian temple in his *Jewish War* (7.420-432). In *Antiquities* (13.69-70), Josephus informs us further that King Ptolemy (VI, 186?-145 BCE) and his wife Cleopatra, in responding to


122 Josephus, *Jewish War*, 1.33, "But Onias, the high priest, fled to Ptolemy, and received a place from him in the nome of Heliopolis, where he built a city resembling Jerusalem, and a temple that was like its temple; concerning which we shall speak more in its proper place hereafter." and 7.420-432 which makes reference to the prophecy in Isaiah which is further explained in more detail in *Antiquities* (13.69-70) as quoted below. Although it is unclear from Josephus whether this temple was founded before or after the Maccabean War, I believe it likely that Onias was involved in the war and construction of the city and temple was delayed during the war although it may have been started prior to the war.

123 Ptolemy VI (186?-145 BCE) was the king that Josephus says authorized Onias' request for a temple. He was called Ptolemy Philometor ("loving his mother"), king of Egypt (181-145 BC), the son of Ptolemy V and Cleopatra I. Earlier during his reign, when Egypt had been invaded by king Antiochus IV, Ptolemy had been made a prisoner. The throne was then given by the Alexandrians to his brother, Ptolemy VII. After Antiochus withdrew, the brothers ruled as joint kings. Conflicts between them arose, and through Roman arbitration, Cyrenaica was given to Ptolemy VII to rule.
Onias’ request to build a Zadokite temple, are said to have placed the blame for the sin and transgression against the Law on the head of Onias, writing the following reply. “King Ptolemy and Queen Cleopatra to Onias, greeting. We have read your petition asking that it be permitted to you to cleanse the ruined temple in Leontopolis in the Nome of Heliopolis, called Bubastis-of-the-Fields. We wonder, therefore whether it will be pleasing to God that a temple be built in a place so wanton ["wantonness” is equated with idolatry in the Wisdom of Solomon (14:26)] and sacred to [the Egyptians’] animals. But since you say that the prophet Isaiah foretold this long ago, we grant your request if this is to be in accordance with the Law, so that we may not seem to have sinned against God in any way.”

Since the Zadokite priests dominated Judaism both politically and theologically prior to the Maccabean War, the charge of ‘idolatry' is not one that the Zadokites themselves would have promoted. Since the Judaism of the Rabbi's dominated history until modern times, it seems important to question what the views of the other side might have been on these issues. Josephus was not a Zadokite. He continues to relate that Onias took over Bubastis-of-the-Fields, ancient Avaris, and built a temple and altar to God. Again he hints that his audience already knows something about this already. Although some might interpret his statement as simply acknowledging the insignificance of this development, we must question why Josephus both begins and ends his account of the Jewish War by speaking about this temple. He states that this Zadokite temple is similar to that at Jerusalem, but smaller and poorer. ... And Onias found some Jews of his own kind, and priests and Levites ministering there. Concerning this temple, however, we have already said enough.

Given the power of the Egyptian high priesthood under Herod in the later years of his reign and the power and influence of the Sadducees on into the first century in the events leading up to the sixties revolt, There is a great deal more that could be said about the importance of this temple for the Sadducean perspective that Josephus is neglecting to tell us explicitly. I believe Josephus' statement that Zadok was a 'Pharisee' goes to the heart of modern uncertainties about this Zadok which is further complicated by uncertainties about the meaning of the term Pharisee.124 I believe that this statement about Judas was meant as

---

124 Steve Mason, Flavius Josephus - Life of Josephus (Boston, Leiden:Brill Academic Publishers, 2003), p. 16, n. 71, cites Ellis Rikvin, "Defining the Pharisees" HUCA 40-1 1969-70, 205-49; A Hidden Revolution (Nashville:Abingdon, 1978) for showing how difficult it is to identify the פרושים of rabbinic literature with the Φαρισαίοι of the Greek texts. Far from claiming the פרושים as their forebears, the earlier rabbis often criticize them a quite separate group (e.g., m. Sotah 3.4). Since the work of Jacob Neusner (1973a and 1973b), in particular, it is now widely accepted that we have only three pertinent source groups (NT, Josephus, and early rabbincic literature) and that each of these uses the “Pharisees” for its own, quite distinct, literary agenda. The fallout from this new methodological rigor has yet to coalesce into broadly accepted results. It is widely agreed, however that certain leading first-century laymen were Pharisees (e.g., Hillel, Gamaliel, Simeon son of Gamaliel), that Pharisees in general believed in some sort of afterlife with post-mortem rewards and
something of an oxymoron to indicate that Judas was a Pharisee who adopted some of the doctrines of the Egyptian Zadokites. At best these two terms together was possibly misleading since Josephus tells us that he himself was a Pharisee who began the Jewish War as a general in Galilee trying to suppress (so he says) the fourth philosophy's war. As Flavius Josephus notes in his *Antiquities* and the *Life*, that he was himself a convinced Pharisee, as well as a proud descendant of Jonathan the Hasmonean. He is believed to have taken 1 Maccabees, a work of pro-Hasmonean propaganda, as his main source for the history of that war. However Josephus also apparently knew the no longer extant work of Jason of Cyrene or at least its surviving abridgement, 2 Maccabees. Both of these latter works have been thought to have been written as works of Zadokite anti-Hasmonean propaganda. Perhaps for this reason Josephus seldom refers to these sources.

punishments, that they accepted angelology and demonology, and that they explicitly recognized a living tradition of teaching (though not yet in the formal terms of Oral Torah) in addition to the Bible. From rabbinic literature and the gospels it appears that they wished to adopt in everyday life the purity requirements for priests and for others entering the temple. The current scholarly tendency is to minimize the Pharisees' place in society, at least their official “power” as distinct from their “influence” and to profess caution about most other issues, including the extent of their role in establishing the rabbinic movement or the degree to which one can recover their tenets and practices from rabbinic literature. Mason cites on the Pharisees and Sadducees or sometimes all three schools together, Lightstone (1975), Saldarini (1988), Sanders (1992), Grabbe (1992:2.463-554), Stemberger (1995), Baumgarten (1997).

125 Josephus tells us (Vita 10-12), “at about sixteen I wished to get experience of the schools of thought to be found among us. ... There are three of these - Pharisees the first, Sadducees the second, Essenes the third. I thought that after a thorough investigation, I should be in a position to select the best. ... on hearing of one named Bannus, who dwelt in the wilderness, wearing only such clothing as trees provided, feeding on such things as grew of themselves, and using frequent ablutions of cold water by day and night, for purity’s sake, I became his devoted disciple. With him I lived for three years and having accomplished my purpose, returned to the city. Being now in my nineteenth year I began to govern my life by the rules of the Pharisees, a sect having points of resemblance to that which the Greeks call the stoic school.” See further about his status as a Pharisee in Vita 1.2-5; *Antiquities* 12.6.1.265 – 13.300. In 166 or 167 B.C.E., especially as emphasized in 1 Macabbees, an aged priest named Mattathias of the Hasmonean family and his five sons refused to make the pagan sacrifice required by the policies of Antiochus and Menelaus. This famous story relates to the tradition of Hannukah celebrated in Judaism every year. The Macabbees lived in the heavily taxed area outside of Jerusalem on the coastal plain in Modin. One of the sons named Judas was a genius as a military leader and was given the Latin name *Maccabeus*. His direction led to a series of brilliant Jewish victories over a succession of royal armies sent by Antiochus Epiphanes. However there is an earlier part of the story that is not so well known but which is important for what we are discussing here.

126 See 2 Maccabees 2:19-23.

127 See, for example, Jonathan A. Goldstein, “The Tales of the Tobiads”, *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults - Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, Part Three Judaism before 70; Jacob Neusner, editor (Leiden:E.J. Brill, 1975), page 85 where Goldstein, an advocate of the former position, suggested, “Throughout his narrative, Josephus supports First Maccabees against Second Maccabees, except in the case of the story of Antiochus IV’s atrocities at Jerusalem, where Josephus was forced by his belief in the veracity of the prophecies of Daniel to emend the text of First Maccabees.” Although not the focus of the present paper, Goldstein argued that Onias IV was the author of 2 Maccabees. See also his commentaries on 1 & 2 Maccabees in the Anchor Bible and Robert Doran, *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees*, (Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981). And now for a more
Antiquities 18.4, the combination of Zadok and Pharisee was perhaps meant to confuse (or more likely to gain the attention of) his audience regarding the lack of integrity of Judas and his cause. Thus we might further ask whether the negative implication here has something to do with the actual origins of Judas' philosophy.

Although various other ancient sources certainly existed in antiquity, the first two books of Maccabees and Josephus are the only three sources now extant describing the Maccabean conflict. Nevertheless an analysis of their nature support the synthesis of events in outline that led to the demise of the Zadokite priesthood in Jerusalem to be eventually replaced after the Maccabean War by the priests of the Hasmonean dynasty. The origins of the Zadokite tradition however were very ancient and were traced back nearly a thousand years to Zadok the prophet at the time of kings Saul and David, through the kings of Judah and then to Ezra and the high priests after the time of Nehemiah. At the time of the Maccabean war the Zadokites were ousted by Antiochus Epiphanies and the Hasmoneans replaced them with their own priests after the war. One might well ask what theological changes this transfer of leadership might have entailed. Onias undoubtedly believed the Hasmoneans were usurpers following after conflicts within his own family as to who was the legitimate heir. Onias founded his temple in exile at Heliopolis in Leontopolis as a Zadokite temple. It is interesting to look at some of the Dead Sea Scrolls literature from the perspective of this kind of Torah in exile.

In a modern biblical translation such as the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV) of the prophet Isaiah, chapter 19 verses 18-20, there is a mention of a "city of the sun" which provides a useful background to these historical developments as described by Josephus. In this modern translation there is a noticeable change from what we were told in the King James version (AV 1611) of the bible:

On that day there will be five cities in the land of Egypt that speak the language of Canaan and swear allegiance to the LORD of hosts. One of these will be called the City of the Sun. In that day shall there be an altar to the LORD in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the LORD.

In Hebrew the word translated here as sun (החרס, heres) is in fact almost identical to the Hebrew word translated as destruction (החרס, heres) as translated in the old AV Authorized or King James Version of verse 18,

---


In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt speak the language of Canaan, and swear to the LORD of hosts; one shall be called, the city of destruction.

This change in translation from 'sun' to 'destruction' was by no means insignificant as has been mentioned.

It is interesting to note that there are Masoretic text traditions of Isaiah 19:18 with יִשְׁרָאֵל now said to mean “city of destruction” and ישורון meaning “city of the sun”.

Thus how the verse is translated depends on which version of the text is considered authoritative. For many modern scholars the meaning of ישורון as “city of destruction” is now seen as a derogatory pun on יִשְׁרָאֵל meaning “city of the sun”, the biblical Hebrew name for the Egyptian city of Heliopolis. The differing ancient Hebrew pronunciations of the Hebrew letter ה (י) and ח may be difficult to write or even reproduce in English with certainty as some texts found at Qumran used ה instead of ח for the article.130

---

130 See Eric D. Reymond, *Qumran Hebrew - An Overview of Orthography, Phonology, and Morphology* (Atlanta:Society of Biblical Literature, 2014), pp. 71-77. According to introduction to Hebrew texts, see for instance, Thomas Lambdin, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1971), p. XVI, the sound of ה “... is an h-sound, but with strong constriction between the base of the tongue and the back of the throat, thus with a much sharper friction than ordinary h”. However on the ancient rendering see Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Winona Lake:Eisenbrauns, 2008 reprint of 1986 Harvard Semitic Studies 29), p. 25f. According to Richard Steiner the roots of the differences in pronunciation had a long history: “It is generally agreed that Proto-Semitic had a voiceless uvular fricative (ʔ) contrasting with a voiceless pharyngeal fricative (#h). One minimal pair that may be plausibly reconstructed for Proto-West-Semitic (PWS) is #hālum, “sand” ≠ *hālum, “maternal uncle.” In the second millennium B.C.E., loanwords in Egyptian show that the contrast was widely maintained in Northwest Semitic. However, there was a dialect written with a reduced version of the Ugaritic alphabet—probably Phoenician—in which this distinction and others had already collapsed or were in the process of collapsing.” Richard C. Steiner, “On the Dating of Hebrew Sound Changes (*H > H and *G > )'). and Greek Translations (2 Esdras and Judith)” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124/2 (2005) p. 230. Here Steiner cites J. E. Hoch, *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), 411-12 and J. Trapper, *Xìgantische Grammatik* (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2000), 73-79,124. In n. 5, Steiner states further, “It is generally assumed that #h was merged with h in Phoenician; see, e.g., Z. S. Harris, A Grammar of the Phoenician Language (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1936), 16-17; and J. Friedrich, W. Röllig, M. G. A. Guzzo, and W. R. Mayer, *Phönizische-punische Grammatik* (3rd ed.; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1999), 11 §9. In support of this assumption, we may note that Phoenician uses D to render Demotic h and h (cf. ဖ 153 below), while Egyptian Aramaic, which preserved #h (see below), uses # for that purpose. (For the data, but a different interpretation, see Y. Muchiki, “Spirantization in Fifth-Century B.C. North-west Semitic,” iVÉS 53 [1994]: 125-30; I am indebted to J. Huehnergard for this reference.) We may perhaps also cite Arab, malāḥum, “sailor” ≠ Akk. malāhum, “sailor.” Normally, Arabic has h in Akkadian loanwords; see n. 156 below. Unless the word for “sailor” was borrowed later than the others or was contaminated by a folk etymology (based on Arab, mūḥ, “salt”), it must have reached Arabic via a Semitic dialect that merged #f with h relatively early. Given Phoenician domination of the sailing profession, Phoenician could well have played such a mediating role with this word.” See Steiner’s article for much further discussion and references and also further below.
Important evidence for first century Jewish usage from the Isaiah scroll XV 19:18 found at Qumran in the late 1940s and conventionally dated c. 100 BCE has for this passage:

It is thus to be noted here that what is now read as יִירָעָה הַשַּׁעַר יִירָעָה "city of the sun" was written in this earliest text. However as can also be seen here the initial article ה in other Dead Sea Scroll texts, is written as ח (π).

The question might well be asked whether this was a difference of linguistic convention or an error on the part of the scribe writing the Qumran text. Was the Masoretic text from c. 1000 CE possibly a later slur on what had been the original text. We might well assume that ancient Judaism was concerned about the accuracy of such matters based on at least a face reading of texts such as Matthew 5:18:

For truly I tell you, until heaven and earth pass away, not one letter, not one stroke of a letter, will pass from the law until all is accomplished.

Since Isaiah is already full of puns, it is also perhaps difficult to say for sure what the underlying intent of the author was. However, the evidence of the Greek Septuagint or LXX version of Isaiah 19:18 (which is also partially paralleled in the Vulgate Latin civitas Solis “city of the sun” ) seems to support the more pro-Zadokite Egyptian interpretation. Thus very possibly this change towards a more negative interpretation in Isaiah 19:18 was based more on a later perception of a very negative significance to this Zadokite temple that

---

131 This rendering is paralleled in a second Isaiah scroll from Qumran (4QIsb) as well.

132 Considerable important scholarship on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls has taken place in Hebrew and has only been partly available in translation. Recently Steven E Fassberg summarized the current situation in his "Israeli Research into Hebrew and Aramaic at Qumran," IN Devorah Dimant, ed., The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective: A History of Research, (Leiden, Boston:Brill, 2012), p. 375, "Today, sixty years after the discovery of the first scrolls, the extent to which the language of the Dead Sea Scrolls reflects a spoken language still remains debated, as does its exact position with regard to Classical Biblical Hebrew, Late Biblical Hebrew, and Tannaitic Hebrew. Of the different linguistic fields, semantics has yet to be fully explored; to date only Kaddari and Morag have dealt with specific semantic fields in a systematic manner. A desideratum is a new and complete grammar based on all the published Dead Sea Scrolls. Qimron is working on such a project and he intends to bring into the discussion all the relevant phenomena from the different ancient Hebrew traditions."

133 There is also the important related issue of mikra (מקרא) in Jewish tradition. See for example Meir Bar -Ilan, "Scribes and Books in the Late Second Commonwealth and Rabbinic Period" in Martin Jan Mulder, Harry Sysling (eds.), Mikra - Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity (Peabody:Hendrickson Publishers, 2004), pp. 21-37. In the same volume, Michael Fishbane, "Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran," pp 339-337.
was built by the high priest Onias. Likely this negative view developed on the part of the Hasmonaeans and the later Rabbinic scholars beginning from the mid-second century BCE but continuing for many centuries afterwards.

Different Septuagint Greek text traditions, with the original at least according to tradition having originated in Egypt, actually render the city in Isaiah 19:18 as “city of righteousness” or “city of Heliopolis”. In comparison to our above mentioned variants of the Hebrew text translated as “of destruction” or “of the sun”, these Greek variant references have all been taken as references to the Zadokite high priest Onias III and IV’s Egyptian Jewish Temple of Leontopolis near Heliopolis - especially since Heliopolis (Greek for “city of the sun god”) is rendered as “city of destruction” in Hebrew as we have already noted. Interestingly, to this consideration of the text of the Septuagint (LXX), which was translated in Egypt in the Ptolemaic era, is the tradition that renders the Hebrew as “city of Righteousness” (πόλις-ασεδέκ). Could this already indicate a connection to the “Teacher of Righteousness” doctrine discovered in some of the sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls? The Greek asedek (ασεδέκ) is generally seen as a transliteration of the Hebrew hesedek (חסדэк) which in Hebrew is said to mean righteous with the article he (ה) and the proper name Zadok (צדק) without. Importantly, it is also possible to have a proper noun with an article in Hebrew, in which case צדэк could also be translated as “the Zadok”.

Importantly, this word heres translated as ‘destruction’ or ‘sun’ (בַּשְׁר) with reference to Onias and his Temple in Egypt is also discussed as part of a Talmudic commentary on Mishnah Menahot (13:10) at the end of Menahot (109ff) in the Babylonian Talmud where the word is said to have both meanings.

134 See for example Thomas O. Lambdin, Introduction to Biblical Hebrew (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1971), p. 12. The verb form of heres is definitely related to destruction as shown by the following quote from Holladay, Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament:


nif.: pf. וָסִרָה, וָסִרָה, וָסִרָה; impf. וָסִרָה, וָסִרָה, וָסִרָה; pt. וָסִרָה: be laid in ruins Je 31:40.

† (pg 84)

135 So according to Eli Cashdan in the Socino edition, צדэк has the meaning of both ‘destruction’ and also ‘the sun’, see p.679, n. 2.
reference to our passage from Isaiah as translated by Eli Cashdan in the Soncino edition (underlining mine):

...Thereupon they [Onias IV and his followers] went to Alexandria in Egypt, built an altar there, and offered thereon sacrifices in honour of God, as it is written, In that day there shall be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt.

Having thus cited from Isaiah 19:19 and linked it to the construction of a Temple in Egypt by Onias IV c. 145 BCE, the Talmud continues to discuss Isaiah 19:18:

One shall be called the city of Heres. What is meant by The city of Heres? — As Rabbi Joseph rendered it in Aramaic: The city of Beth Shemesh [the sun], which is destined to destruction, will be said to be one of them. But whence do we know that Heres signifies the sun? For it is written [Job 9:7], Who commandeth the sun [heres] and it riseth not.

The Talmud then continues to critique this interpretation of Isaiah by Onias, playing on the Talmudic description of Aramaic as a daughter of a voice (literally bath qol - בה 깥ול) beginning with a quote from Isaiah 43:6.

Bring My sons from far, and My daughters from the ends of the earth. ‘Bring My sons from far’: Rabbi Huna said, These are the exiles in Babylon, who are at ease like sons. ‘And My daughters from the ends of the earth’: These are the exiles in other lands, who are not at ease, like daughters.

Rabbi Abba ben Rabbi Isaac said in the name of Rabbi Hisda — others say, Rab Judah said in the name of Rab, From Tyre to Carthage the nations know Israel and their Father who is in heaven; but from Tyre westwards and from Carthage eastwards the nations know neither Israel nor their Father who is in heaven...“*

---

136 Job 9:7 has the Hebrew: יְרָד. Besides this passage in Job, the word is also used in Judges (1:35; 2:9; and 8:13) including the following reference to Gideon translated in the NRSV as: When Gideon son of Joash returned from the battle by the ascent of Heres.

137 Thus for example Babylonian Talmud Sotah (33a), in the midst of a discussion of Aramaic (בעז לך) and the accepted language of prayer: Behold it has been taught: Johanan, the High Priest, heard a Bath Qol issue from within the Holy of Holies announcing [in Aramaic], ‘The young men who went to wage war against Antioch have been victorious.’ It also happened with Simeon the Righteous that he heard a Bath Qol issue from within the Holy of Holies announcing, ‘Annullé is the decree which the enemy intended to introduce into the Temple’. Then was Caius Caligula slain and his decrees annulled. They noted down the time [when the Bath Kol spoke] and it tallied. Now it was in Aramaic that it spoke! — If you wish I can say that it is different with a Bath Kol since it occurs for the purpose of being generally understood; or if you wish I can say that it was Gabriel who spoke; for a Master has declared: Gabriel came and taught [Joseph] the seventy languages.

138 This latter statement may relate to the emphasis on the sun at Heliopolis and Isaiah 38:8, “Behold, I will bring again the shadow of the degrees, which is gone down in the sun dial of Ahaz, ten degrees backward. So the sun returned ten degrees, by which degrees it was gone down.” Cashdan cites the view of M. Schwartz, Das Heilige Land, p. 274 that ‘westwards’ and eastwards’ were transposed in error.
Could it be that this allusion to Isaiah can be seen to apply to the Zadokite emphasis on their unique hereditary qualifications as the 'sons of Zadok' to the office of High Priest? If so it is thus a critique of the failure of the Zadokite mission to win the whole Jewish nation quite apart from the gentiles with whom it is generally related in modern Christian interpretations. This critique would be even more negative if the influence of this Temple had a major impact on the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem in 70 CE.

There is also the aforementioned question as to how much distinction there was between he (ה) and het (נ) in the late second temple era. What are we to make of heres (様々) in the Qumran Great Isaiah Scroll (4QIsa) version? This is not the usual word for sun in Hebrew (שמש) nor is it the transliteration of the Egyptian On (ון). Significantly, Targum Isaiah renders "City of the Sun" with the addition of that "is about to be desolate" in Isaiah 19:18: מַעְרָבְתָּא שֶמֶשַׁא דָּבְא לְחַבְּרָא. 139 Thus Bruce D. Chilton stated in his 1987 commentary on the Aramaic concerning whether the Masoretic text rendering of 'destruction' or 'sun' is correct, that the meturgeman or translator here in Targum Isaiah "shows an awareness of both possibilities, although his preference would appear to be for the second." 140 Chilton's earlier work on Targum Isaiah, The Glory of Israel discussed major themes of the targum in terms of Aramaic terms that have at least proto-sobriquet implications: Law (אֱוָנָה), Sanctuary (מקדשא), House of Israel (ישראל בית), and The Righteous (צדיקיא). 141 These possible proto-sobriquet terms would also seem to be related to issues concerning the prophetic creation and use of names and other issues raised by Tal Ilan in her important Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity which will be discussed further below. 142

Of relevance to our task of examining what survives of ancient texts such as Targum Isaiah, Josephus and the Mishnah from the first century are questions of what precisely did the writers intend and how accurately have their intentions been transmitted down to us? How careful were ancient scribes about even the letters they used and where? Or even how concerned were they in their reading or writing the difference in sounds? As Malachi Martin pointed out long ago concerning Qumran scribal technique, with likely implications to pre-70 CE scribal techniques more generally, there are difficulties in trying to apply the

---


later medieval Masoretic schema of Hebrew vocalization and orthography to Hebrew texts from the first century:

...when examining past studies on the Qumran Scrolls we have noted more than one writer who started off from this point of view, and in consequence was led to regard many Scroll forms as illiteracies, solecisms and manifestations of incompetence. Although Martin argued that some comparison with the Masoretic scheme is both necessary and desirable, ultimately there is, for us, an ultimate question of discernment in cases such as Isaiah 19:18: of exactly what the original pre-70 CE intention and meaning was. To me it seems very likely that different scribes by the first century CE, be they Zadokite-Sadducee, Pharisee or Essene, had their own differing opinions. I believe this became especially true for the important Dead Sea Scrolls expression translated into English as the Teacher of Righteousness. The Septuagint (LXX) rendering mentioned above, which was translated in Egypt in the Ptolemaic era, gives the significant interpretation of the Hebrew of Isaiah 19:18 as “the city of righteousness” (πόλις-ασεδεκ). Thus we will look further at the question raised above as to whether there could have been a connection between this doctrine of the Teacher of Righteousness, the Egyptian Zadokite temple and Isaiah 19:18-19? We will look first at issues raised by the Isaiah Targum and Septuagint translations more generally.

For example on the issue of sun worship underlying the name Heliopolis in Isaiah can be compared with the Targum of Isaiah 24:23. The Masoretic text of Isaiah gives the following translation:

\[\text{ Attempts to evaluate the Greek translation of Esaias in the past have typically failed to note the complexity of such a task. One can find numerous passages where the translator has failed to understand the Hebrew text and where his Greek appears to be solecistic and even unintelligible. It is therefore natural to infer that he lacked competence. The problem with this conclusion, however, is that it does not take into account the skill, knowledge and creativity that he displays in many other passages. Moreover, any generalizations about the translator's technique run afoot of the startling variations in his approach.} \]

---


144 Matthew A Collins concludes op. cit. p. 209. "Our investigation has a number of implications and above all promotes the need for a heightened sensitivity regarding the unique and/or inter-related nature of individual texts and the designations found therein. It can no longer be assumed uncritically that different forms of the sobriquets are merely insignificant variants. Instead our approach has uncovered the intricacies of a developmental process, the broad contours of which find both support and explanation within the sociology of deviance and labelling theory." He cites P.R. Davies ‘Eschatology at Qumran’, *JBL* 1041985: 48.

145 See also Moisés Silva, “Esaias - To the Reader” IN Albert Piertesma and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint - And Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under That Title* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 823. In his introduction to his recent Oxford translation of the Greek version of Isaiah, Moisés Silva describes some of the challenges presented to a modern interpreter by the original translation from Hebrew Isaiah into the Greek (Esaias):
Then the moon will be abashed, and the sun ashamed; for the LORD of hosts will reign on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before his elders he will manifest his glory.\textsuperscript{146}

While the Septuagint of this verse seems to avoid the issue:

And the brick shall decay, and the wall shall fall; for the Lord shall reign from out of Sion, and out of Jerusalem, and shall be glorified before his elders.\textsuperscript{147}

The Targum of Isaiah has the more explicit:

Then those who serve the moon will be ashamed, and those who worship the sun will be humiliated, because the kingdom of the LORD of hosts will be revealed on the Mount of Zion and in Jerusalem, and before the elders of his people in glory.\textsuperscript{148}

Significant to this is a passage from \textit{Megillah} 3a cited by Bruce Chilton which may relate to the conflicts in Judaism described by Josephus,

\begin{quote}
R. Jeremiah—or some say R. Hiyya b. Abba—also said: The Targum of the Pentateuch was composed by Onqelos the proselyte under the guidance of R. Eleazar and R. Joshua. The Targum of the Prophets was composed by Jonathan ben Uzziel under the guidance of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, and the land of Israel quaked over an area of four hundred parasangs by four hundred parasangs, and a bath qol came forth and exclaimed, Who is this that has revealed my secrets to mankind? Jonathan b. Uzziel arose and said, It is I who have revealed your secrets to mankind. It is fully known to you that I have not done this for my own honour or for the honour of my father’s house, but for your honour I have done it, that dissension might not increase in Israel.\textsuperscript{149}
\end{quote}

Although the challenges is determining authorship and dating here which Chilton discusses are difficult to resolve, much of the text of Targum Isaiah does fit well into the context of the pre-70 first century Jewish socio-political situation and can be seen as an attempt to ameliorate the dissensions within Judaism of that time.

\textsuperscript{146} From the Hebrew:

\begin{verbatim}
תפערת, הַלְּבָנָה וּמְשַׁלָּחַ֖ה הנֵֽהְמָה, כִּרְמֵלָה יַהֲקִית עֵבָּדָֽה מִךְּרָמָֽה, יָקִין, נוֹרַ֩תֶלְּלֵֹֽשֶּׁלֶתֶנָֽה טַחַת מִֽנְחָֽתָֽלְּבָנָה
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{147} καὶ ταχῆςται η ἡλίους καὶ πεσεῖται το τέίχος ὅτι βασιλεύσει κύριος ἐν Σιων καὶ ἐν Ιερουσαλημ καὶ ἐνώπιον τῶν πρεσβυτέρων δοξασθήσεται τά


\textsuperscript{149} Bruce D. Chilton, \textit{The Glory of Israel}, pp.1-2.
In 1948, almost as the Great Isaiah scroll was being discovered at Qumran, Seeligmann already believed that there was a strong connection between the Septuagint translation of Isaiah and the Zadokite Temple in Heliopolis. Although Seeligmann’s 1948 thesis did not have access to the texts of Isaiah discovered at Qumran, he nevertheless did have a deep knowledge of the Hebrew ancient sources that were known in his time. In interpreting the Greek of Isaiah he was not afraid to challenge what later became the Masoretic text of Isaiah. For example the Masoretic text of Isaiah 53:10-11 reads:

Yet it was the will of the LORD to crush him with pain. When you make his life an offering for sin, he shall see his offspring, and shall prolong his days; through him the will of the LORD shall prosper. He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities.

However the LXX has:

And the Lord desires to cleanse him from his blow. If you give an offering for sin, your soul shall see a long-lived offspring. And the Lord wishes to take away from the pain of his soul, to show him light, and to fill him with understanding; to justify a righteous one who is well subject to many, and he himself shall bear their sins.

As Robert Hanhart pointed out in his 2004 introduction to the Mohr Siebeck reprint of Seeligmann’s work, the Dead Sea Isaiah scrolls both corroborate Seeligmann’s analysis of what must have been the original Hebrew for Isaiah 53:10/11 as רָאִי הַיְּרֵאֵה where the Septuagint has δείξαι αὐτῷ φῶς, “to show him light”.150 One
wonders about the possibility of a connection between this emphasis on light and Heliopolis. Already in Isaiah 19:18 there is a textual variant which has ἀσεδηλίου which Henry Redpath at least suggested might be ἀσεδ ἥλιου. Although Silva translates this part of the Septuagint Isaiah with a proper noun as, The one city will be called Asedek City, there is through all of this apparently some kind of a connection in the Hebrew between Zadok, ‘righteousness’ and Egypt. Thus, significantly there is also a reference to יַצְּדִיק צַדִיק עַבְדִי in this passage translated by the NRSV as “shall my righteous servant justify”. Of the over fifty instances where righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) is now found in the Septuagint of Isaiah, forty-six of them translate some form of the Hebrew word zedek. These begin with Isaiah 1:21:

How the faithful city has become a whore! She that was full of justice, righteousness lodged in her-- but now murderers!\(^{151}\)

For which Silva translates the Septuagint Greek adding 'wherein':

How the faithful city Sion has become a whore! She that was full of justice, wherein righteousness lodged - but now murderers!\(^{152}\)

Targum Isaiah avoids the use of יַצְּדִיק here but instead has the possibly conciliatory:

And I will appoint in you true judges, steadfast as at the first, and your counsellors, as at the beginning. Afterward thou shall be called the city of truth, the faithful city.\(^{153}\)

two Isaiah scrolls from Qumran, offering an older proto-Masoretic text and a younger that otherwise hardly deviates from MT. In 1948 Seeligmann believed — without paying more attention to the question of the original form of the Hebrew text — that he could detect, based on analogous forms of translations in the Septuagint, the point of origin of one of the most widely used phrases of later Gnostic literature: τὸ τῆς γνώσεως φῶς. The new textual basis provided by Qumran, paired with a reconstruction of the original Hebrew text, gained according to a similar process of analogy: תִּהְיֶה צֶדֶק מַעָל הַגְּרוֹעָה, provoked him to the explanation that we should regard the biblical tradition of the Qumranic community which he identifies with the Essenes as the point of origin of a religious movement that will result in Alexandrian Judaism, analogous to Philo’s report on the Therapeutae. Here, in regard to the connection of Palestinian-Jerusalemite with Alexandrian Judaism—a view explicated by Seeligmann with similar arguments in 1948 when he assumed that the temple of Leontopolis functioned as the centre of the Jerusalemite biblical tradition for the transfer of the Septuagint”.

\(^{151}\) Masoretic Hebrew:

אִישָּה יִקְחוּ הָלוֹʔָה הָרָה נֶאִסָּה נְאָאִיס נְאָאִיס מְשָׁפִּים פֵּרְקָי יְלָה בַּֽלַּֽעַת מְרַחֲמֵהוֹז:  

\(^{152}\) πῶς ἐγένετο πόρνη πόλις πιστὴ Σιων πλήρης κρίσεως ἐν ἑ δικαιοσύνη ἐκκοιμήθη ἐν αὐτῇ νῦν δὲ φονευταὶ in the LXX.
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The theme of possibly Zadokite-related righteousness which can perhaps be seen here in verse 1:26 of the Masoretic text can be seen as a very important parallel to 19:18 in the reference to a faithful city:

*And I will restore your judges as at the first, and your counselors as at the beginning. Afterward you shall be called the city of righteousness, the faithful city.*

Similarly the Septuagint of 1:26 has:

*And I will set up your judges as at the former time and your counselors as at the beginning. And after these things you shall be called the city of righteousness, the faithful mother city, Sion.*

Although there are many places where the Isaiah Targum avoids using צדיקא, in Isaiah 12:3 there are textual variants between צדיקא and צדקא:

*And ye shall receive a new doctrine with joy from the chosen of the righteous.*

This Aramaic interpretation can be compared with the Masoretic Hebrew and the Greek LXX:

*With joy you will draw water from the wells of salvation.*

Neither of these texts makes reference to צד.

As well as the connection with Isaiah 19:18-19 already noted, Seeligmann noted further that there was a connection with the Septuagint translation of Isaiah 10:24:

154 Note the possible parallel in ‘city of righteousness’:

155 καὶ ἐπιστήσω τοὺς κριτὰς σου ὡς τὸ πρότερον καὶ τοὺς συμβούλους σου ὡς τὸ ἀπὸ ἀρχὴς καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα κληθήσεται πόλις δικαιοσύνης μητρόπολις πιστὴ Σιων πιστὴ Σιων

156 Isaiah 11:5 καὶ ἐσται δικαιοσύνη ἐξεσκελοῦν τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀλήθεια εἰλημένος τὰς πλευρὰς

154 Isaiah 11:5
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Therefore this is what the Lord Sabaoth says: O my people, who live in Sion, do not be afraid of the Assyrians, because he will beat you with a rod, for I bring a stroke upon you so that you may see the way of Egypt.

This exhortation to ‘see the way of Egypt’ can well be contrasted to the Hebrew text which reads

Therefore thus says the Lord GOD of hosts: O my people, who live in Zion, do not be afraid of the Assyrians when they beat you with a rod and lift up their staff against you as the Egyptians did. 157

The Greek version can be seen as perhaps supporting the role of the temple of Onias in Egypt. It also seems further significant that the Greek word translated here as ‘way’ (δόξα) is the same Greek word that is used of a philosophical path in Greek from as early as Plato (e.g. Gorgias 524a τῶ δόξα, ἥ μὲν εἰς μακάρων νήσους, ἥ δ’ εἰς Τάρταρον) and is also so used in the New Testament as a direction of faith. Examples from Matthew’s Gospel include 10:5 εἰς δόξαν ἔθνων μὴ ἀπέλθητε do not go in the way of the Gentiles and importantly 7:13:

Enter through the narrow gate; for the gate is wide and the road (ἡ δόξα) is easy that leads to destruction, and there are many who take it.

This word δόξα was further used as a name for the early Christians and is an important concept in the sectarian literature of Qumran. It may also have important implications for a re-evaluation of how the Greek text of Josephus Antiquities 18 was emended in early modern times as will be discussed further below.

An examination in more detail of what Josephus has to say about our Isaiah passage may help us here as well. In his later twenty volume work, the Antiquities Josephus relates importantly that at the time of the Maccabean war, the Zadokite high priests Onias III and IV were influenced not only by the prophecy ‘already in the prophet Isaiah’ (19:18-19) which Josephus says Onias used as a ‘proof-text’ to justify building a replica of the Jerusalem temple in Egypt. Importantly Josephus further adds concerning Onias, as typically translated into English: “and many other things did he prophesy on account of (δόξα) this place (τοπον).” Here too it is significant to note a play on words in the Greek because the Greek preposition dia (δόξα) can be translated: "on account of” while the Greek

157 See the original Masoretic Hebrew:

ןַלְשָׁנִים אָחָן יְהוֹעֵשׁ בַּעֲשֵׂה בָּאָלֶיתּוֹן יְהוֹעֵשׁ יְשַׁעֲלָה בָּאוּדִי מַעְלִים
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topon (τὸπον) also meant a ‘passage (of an author [i.e. Isaiah here]).’ Thus Josephus could well also be interpreted as saying of Onias here (13:68),

“for the prophet Isaiah foretold that ‘there should be an altar in Egypt to the Lord God,’ and many other such things did he [Onias] prophesy on account of this passage.”

At least according to Josephus, Onias seems to have seen himself as the messianic “saviour” as further outlined in Isaiah.

Josephus’ comment about Onias’ use of prophecy may thus be also seen to fit into a larger context of Isaiah. For example chapter 19 begins:

See, Yahweh is riding on a swift cloud and comes to Egypt; the idols of Egypt will tremble at his presence, and the heart of the Egyptians will melt within them. I will stir up Egyptians against Egyptians, and they will fight, one against the other, neighbour against neighbour, city against city, kingdom against kingdom;...

In choosing this passage Onias can be seen to be adopting a stance contrary to the ungodliness of existing Egyptian society. Given the persecution and assassination of Onias III prior to the beginning of the Maccabean war, these words from a section of Isaiah (5:23) denouncing social injustices in Judah and Jerusalem may also be seen to have special significance:

who justify (מצדיקו) the ungodly for rewards, and take away the righteousness (צדקתו) of the righteous (צדקיו).

158 A significant parallel of this usage of topon (τὸπον) as ‘passage’ is in the Gospel of Luke (4:17), where it says of Jesus, And the book of the prophet Isaiah was handed to him. And he opened the book, and found the place (τὸπον) where it was written... I believe that this Lukan parallel is more than just a coincidence. Over half the New Testament quotes from the Hebrew scriptures are taken from Isaiah. Isaiah’s messianic theology is strongly linked to Jesus. Isaiah is the only book of the scriptures that Jesus is specifically mentioned as reading. Because of the prevalence of the Greek Septuagint, even Hellenistic listeners in Luke’s audience may have already been aware of the important messianic interpretations based on Isaiah in Judaism and they may even have known that there was this additional connection with the Oniad Zadokite cause. Importantly Isaiah was also an important work at Qumran. Relating perhaps also to the concept of miqra or the correct recitation of scripture, as we have already noted above, there was significant textual variation relating to Isaiah 19:19. This becomes even more evident in more distinctly sectarian Qumran texts such as pesher Habakkuk as opposed to strictly biblical texts such as the Great Isaiah scroll.

159 I use the Whiston translation of Josephus unless otherwise noted. καὶ γὰρ Ἡσαίας ὁ προφήτης τοῦτο προείπεν ἐσται θυσιαστήριον ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ κυρίω τῷ θεῷ καὶ πολλὰ ὁ προφήτης ἔπειν ἀλλὰ τοιαύτα διὰ τῶν τόπων

160 Isaiah 5:23:
The triple plays on forms of mazedeke, zadokoth, zedekim here in the original Hebrew does not come across in translation. Targum Isaiah has only zakkay that sounds merely a bit like zedek with textual variants זָכָּא or זָכָּא meaning "just, innocent, righteous".

One is tempted to see, in this context of righteousness and the controversy concerning the ‘city of the sun’, connections with Dead Sea Scrolls texts such as 1Q27//4Q300 that equate righteousness with the light of the sun:

*This shall be the sign* that this shall come to pass, *when the times of evil are shut up and wickedness is banished in the presence of righteousness, as darkness in the presence of light, or as smoke vanishes and is no more, in the same way wickedness will vanish forever and righteousness will be manifest like the sun.*

Certainly also the prophet Malachi (3:20) already had such a connection that is also found in 4QXIIa col. IV:

*But for you who revere my name the sun of righteousness shall rise, with healing in its wings. You shall go out leaping like calves from the stall.*

It would thus appear that these kinds of connections between Zadok and righteousness had a lengthy trajectory already in the Ptolemaic era.

An important ancient text worth considering here as well is the Wisdom of Sirach (also known as the Book of Ecclesiasticus). It predates Josephus’ post 70 CE writings by nearly three centuries in Hebrew and in Greek by two. Its discovery in Hebrew at Qumran and Masada shows that it was possibly of importance to the zealots who held out at Masada after the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem in 70 CE. As pointed out by John J. Collins, in his discussion of the murder of the High Priest Simon’s son Onias in 172 BCE (2 Maccabees 4:34) and the founding of the Jewish temple in Leontopolis by Simon’s grandson Onias IV,

*We cannot know whether Ben Sira had an inkling of impending problems when he prayed for the preservation of the line. The Greek translator dropped the prayer for Simon and substituted a prayer that God might redeem Israel "in our days". If Sirach*

---

wrote during the High Priesthood of Onias III, the praise of Simon would redound to the glory of his son, but would also serve as a reminder to the son of the standards set by the father.\textsuperscript{162}

Some of this later controversy may well be evidenced in the differences between translations however. As pointed out by Pancratius C. Beentjes,\textsuperscript{163} there are significant differences from the original Hebrew in comparison to the Greek (and Syriac) translations of \textit{Sirach} 50:12 in discussing the liturgical stature of Simon the High Priest:

\textit{When he received the portions from the hands of the priests, as he stood by the hearth of the altar with a garland of brothers (στέφανος ἀδελφῶν) around him, he was like a young cedar on Lebanon surrounded by the trunks of palm trees.}

Instead of the Greek 'garland of brothers' (στέφανος ἀδελφῶν), the Hebrew has 'crown of sons' (עטרת בנים). While the original Hebrew could literally have described Simon's sons as being present with him in the Temple worship, subsequent developments over the propriety of the Zadokite high priesthood and its inheritance may have motivated the choice of the Greek to use 'brothers' (ἀδελφῶν) here.

Although the \textit{Wisdom of Sirach} did not make it into either the western protestant Christian or Jewish biblical canons,\textsuperscript{164} it is important because it contains history and doctrinal views considered to have been written c. 200-175 BCE and it has both Hebrew and Greek versions which date from pre-70 CE. Manfred R. Lehman's 1961 \textit{Revue de Qumran} article, "Ben Sira and the Qumran Literature" is an important example of earlier Qumran scholarship on this topic that is useful to revisit here.\textsuperscript{165} Sirach is important for what it tells us about important aspects of Jewish worship and use of scripture before the Hasmonean period: at the time of the Zadokite high priesthood. It also presents a history in chapters 44-50 in


\textsuperscript{164} It is considered canonical by the Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox and most of the Oriental Orthodox.

\textsuperscript{165} Manfred R. Lehmann, “Ben Sira and the Qumran Literature,” \textit{Revue de Qumran} 9 (1961): 103-16 and more recently James C. Vanderkam, "Qumran Research in the United States: The Non-Sectarian Texts" IN Devorah Dimant, \textit{The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective: A History of Research}, (Leiden, Boston:Brill, 2012), pp. 81-82. Although more recently Otto Mulder has pointed out in his 2003 \textit{Simon the High Priest in Sirach 50}, Lehman may not have been correct in concluding that Ben Sira was based on a lunar calendar, Lehman was visionary in seeing the importance of the Sira fragments at Qumran. See Otto Mulder, \textit{Simon the High Priest in Sirach 50} - \textit{An Exegetical Study of the Significance of Simon the High Priest as Climax to the Praise of the Fathers in Ben Sira's Concept of the History of Israel}, Leiden: Brill, 2003,p. 129.
which Ben Sira praises "men of reknown, and our fathers in their generation," starting with the antediluvian Enoch (a figure prominent in some of the non biblical Dead Sea Scrolls texts) and continuing through to the Zadokite "Simon the high priest, son of Onias" (300-270 BCE).  

Mulder has critiqued Lehmann's analysis of why Sirach 50 does not parallel the customary liturgical arrangements associated with Yom Kippur which Lehmann derived from the comparatively late rabbinic Talmud tractate Yoma. But this difference between later Rabbinic approach and the Zadokite 'pre-Hasmonean' evidence in Sirach is important evidence for our investigation here. Mulder notes what he considers to be Lehmann's erroneous view that 'Ben Sira, rooted in his 'pre-Hasmonean environment', placed greater emphasis on the Davidic king than on the High Priestly messiah in the Sadducean tradition." Mulder critiques here that Lehmann had suggested that this emphasis on the Davidic messiah was "in harmony with the main line of thought at Qumran", and explicitly rejects this assumption about Qumran and the emphasis of Ben Sira. Yet significantly Lehmann's many important insights about this text and its relation to the Zadokite priesthood are worthy of further investigation. The parallels between Sirach 50 and the also Egyptian-based Septuagint Greek version of Isaiah 11:1-5 will be discussed further below.

The Septuagint (or LXX) is another text with strong connections to Egypt. The three oldest now existing complete texts of the LXX were copied from older texts probably more than 600 years after the original translations were made. It was the first and most important of a number of ancient translations of the Hebrew bible into Greek. The letter of Aristeas, a pseudepigraphical book thought to have been written in the second half of the second century B.C.E. states that the Septuagint dates back to the previous century. Ptolemy II, called Philadelphus, the king of Egypt from 285-247 B.C.E., is said to have wanted a Greek translation of the Hebrew torah for his famous library at Alexandria. According to this account, the then high priest in Jerusalem Eleazar sent 72 men, six men from each tribe to Egypt with a scroll of the law. In 72 days they translated a section each from the law. Afterwards they decided on the wording together. Thus the title of the work - Septuagint - which means “70” and is abbreviated “LXX”. Many New Testament quotes from the Hebrew scriptures are taken from the Septuagint - however some are obviously not. The reliance of many Greek-speaking converts to Christianity on the LXX, especially to prove that Jesus was the messiah or “anointed one” (translated in Greek as Christos and written as “Christ” in English) – as well as Gnostic controversies also apparently led Greek-speaking Jewish communities to abandon use of the LXX after 100 C.E.

---

166 Although some commentators view Ben Sira as contemporary of Simon the Just (Shim’on HaTzadik), many deem it more likely he was contemporary with the second Oniad high priest Simon II (219=199 BCE). See the Hebrew daat.ac.il article on Ben Sira אנציקלופדיה יהודית דעת - בן סירא http://www.daat.ac.il/encyclopedia/value.asp?id1=1464 Retrieved 2015-02-14.
While scholarly attempts were made in the nineteenth century to re-name the LXX text more accurately as “the Alexandrian Version”, the name “Septuagint” has remained in popular usage. Alexandria, in Egypt, had a large Jewish as well as Samaritan population, especially because of relations with the Ptolemies and a Greek translation of the Hebrew scriptures was probably needed as the population was losing its knowledge of Hebrew. The translation of works such as Isaiah and Sirach into Greek appear to have happened later and the circumstances surrounding their translation are likely important but difficult to ascertain now. Later works, especially Daniel have significant changes in the LXX from the Hebrew version of the bible. Hebrew biblical texts discovered at Qumran often parallel the Septuagint translation rather than the modern Masoretic text. Some texts from the LXX and Qumran are closer to the Samaritan Pentateuch, perhaps reflecting a time when the Samaritan traditions were closer than they later became or relations with the Samaritans were less hostile than they subsequently became.

A profound conclusion of the Lönnqvists in their Hidden Qumran mentioned above was that the so-called Tomb of Jason discovered in 1956 and excavated by L.Y. Rahmani, may actually have been the Tomb of Zadok mentioned in the Copper Scroll discovered in Cave 3 at Qumran. The issues raised by the archaeological interpretation of the significance of this interpretation for the burial site provide insights into how evidence relating to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Josephus are seen more generally. Prior to the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls the term "sons of Zadok" had little significance and writing specifically associated with the Zadokites were not much in evidence. That texts such as MMT from Qumran might have Sadducee connections has only gradually been realized.

While historical datings for the Dead Sea Scrolls have found a wide variety of opinions in scholarship since their discovery, it is important to consider the events leading up to the Maccabean war with tensions between Jerusalem and the Seleucids to the north and the Ptolemies to the south to put the Oniad temple into context. After the capitulation to Alexander the Great in 332 BCE, the high priests of Jerusalem were aligned first with one kingdom and then the other with various sympathizers aligned also with the alternative power block not currently in dominant power. After more than a century of conflict, Jerusalem fell under the control of the Seleucids in 200 BCE.

Either ignored or described differently by Josephus,169 the book of 2 Maccabees (3:1-40) describes the earlier history of how after 175 BCE, the Seleucid king Antiochus’ governor

---

169 J.A. Goldstein, “Tales of the Tobiads”, Christianity, 55 Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults - Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty, Part 3 (Leiden, 1975), argued (page 94) concerning Josephus’ use of sources, “First, Josephus’ only source for the events was one which Josephus, having the biases we noted above, found incredible. On the basis of his own presuppositions and aims he tried to “correct” it. Second, the Antiquities is a large work, written when Josephus turned over to his Greek secretaries to copy and restyle from existing Greek sources, reserving for himself the important tasks of translating Hebrew and Aramaic sources and revising content. Sometimes he overlooked passages which needed to be revised, as in the numerous cross-references taken over from his sources which now have nothing to refer to in Josephus’ work. The Tobiad stories contain such overlooked passages.” Given that 2 Maccabees was possibly an early attempt to reconcile with the Zadokites in Egypt by the Hasmoneans, Josephus may have wanted to avoid any implication of sympathy to this connection.
of Coele Syria, Apollonius, was informed of the wealth in the temple of Jerusalem belonging to Hyrcanus by a certain Simon who was captain of the temple and probably a son of Joseph the Tobiah. At least according to the account of 2 Maccabees, Simon had apparently quarrelled with Onias III and was seeking revenge. When Apollonius informed Antiochus about the money in Jerusalem, the king ordered his chancellor, Heliodorus, to go there to seize the funds, 400 silver talents and 200 gold. A divine miracle is said to have occurred which prevented him from carrying out the order and which, according to the account in 2 Maccabees, everyone attributed to God’s intervention.

The book of 2 Maccabees (4:1-6) further states that Simon countered by trying to make further trouble, so that Onias III decided to go personally to Antioch to see the king in 175 B.C.E. While Onias was in Antioch, King Antiochus III’s son Seleucus IV (who had originally succeeded Antiochus after the father’s death c. 187 B.C.E.), was assassinated by Heliodorus. This did not bode well for the Onias III. After his brother Jason and then later, Menelaus were made his successors, Onias III was himself assassinated in 171 B.C.E. Onias III did not return to Jerusalem but remained at the sanctuary of the Greek sun god Apollo at Daphne near Antioch in Syria until his death as mentioned above with regards to a possible etymology of the word Essene. Since Apollo was also the oracular god patron of Delphi, there already seems a prophetic connection in this as well.

According to both the Palestinian Talmud Yoma 6.3 43c-d (and the parallel Babylonian Talmud Mas. Menachoth (109b)) Onias IV’s flight to Egypt (c. 164 B.C.E.) was the result of his brother, Shimei, deceiving him into serving at the altar dressed in woman’s rather than the High Priest’s garments which might possibly relate to stories about the clothing of the Esseni.

Forty years Simeon the Righteous served Israel in the high priesthood and in the final year he said to them: During this year I shall die. They said to him: Whom shall we appoint after you? He said to them: Behold Onias my son is before you. They went and appointed Onias, and Simeon his brother was jealous of him. He (Simeon) went and put a gown on him (Onias) and girded him with a girdle. He said to them: See what he promised his beloved. He said to her when I serve in the high priesthood I’ll put on your gown and gird your girdle. They looked into the matter and did not find him. They said from there he fled to the Mountain of the King and from there he fled to Alexandria, and he stood and

---


171 See 2 Maccabees 4:33

built there an altar, and regarding it read the passage “In that day there shall be an altar to the Lord inside the land of Egypt” (Isaiah 19,19). Behold this matter is an a fortiori: If one who fled power see how he coveted it in the end, one who is empowered and then removed from power all the more so (will covet power in the end)! It was learned (in a baraita): these are the words of R. Meir.

R. Judah says: No, rather they appointed Simeon and Onias his brother was jealous of him. He (Onias) went and put a gown on him (Simeon) and girded him with a girdle. He said to them: See what he promised his beloved, and the rest (of the story unfolded) as (presented) previously. Behold this matter is an a fortiori: If one who was not (even) empowered see how he incited Israel to idolatry, one who was empowered and then removed from power all the more so (will incite Israel to idolatry)!

In his important analysis, Amram Tropper considers this shorter Palestinian account of this story to be closer to the original than the one in the Babylonian Talmud. He argues that the tradition of Rabbi Meir was likely more truthful than that of Rabbi Judah.

For R. Judah, Onias is the trickster and Simeon the dupe but for R. Meir, Simeon is the trickster and Onias the dupe. R. Meir thus ascribes the foundation of an illicit high place to an innocent and well-meaning high priest who was also Simeon the Righteous’s rightful heir, while depicting Simeon the Righteous’s de facto heir as a duplicitous fiend. Understandably this startling portrayal of the good schismatic and the evil leader of the Jerusalem establishment may well have disturbed some sages in late antiquity. By contrast, R. Judah’s negative view of Onias and positive view of Simeon is far less surprising. R. Meir’s account, consequently, is the lectio difficilior, the more difficult reading, and most likely the more original of the two. R. Meir’s positive portrayal of Onias and negative portrayal of Simeon apparently disturbed R. Judah (or, the author of the narrative attributed to him), who consequently reversed the moral stature of the two characters in order to condemn the schismatic sanctuary and salvage the honor of the Jerusalem temple.173

173 Ibid. p. 170. Tropper (p. 173f) rejects the view of Ben-Zion Luria, "Mihu honia?" Beir Miqra (5727, 1966) in Hebrew, pp. 65-81 of separate sources. Tropper states, "The Babylonian Talmud’s twin foundation stories for the temple of Onias are so similar to the Palestinian Talmud’s counterparts in respect to substance, plotline, details and vocabulary that there is obviously a close genetic connection, a close causal relationship, between the parallel presentations.... Since the Babylonian Talmud’s expansions consist primarily of clarifications and embellishments, i.e. additions and adjustments of an editorial nature, one is well-justified in applying here the traditional text-critical principle, lectio brevior lectio potior—the shorter reading is the more probable one. Indeed, it seems highly unlikely that the Palestinian Talmud would have omitted all these details had it known them." However another possibility is that the reader and audience's collective memory knew more details than the story was telling. To me this is the flaw with Tropper's statement (p. 160), "Since the temple stood and operated for over two hundred years, it is truly striking that the only ancient references to it appear in Josephus’s writings and rabbinic literature. No other sources from Palestine or the diaspora explicitly relate to the temple of Onias and this silence is often interpreted, correctly in my opinion, as a product of the temple’s relative insignificance. The temple was not erected in a central location like Alexandria or Memphis but in a backwater town and its geographical location in the periphery apparently matched its marginal role in the lives of Egyptian Jews." On this Tropper cites Victor Tcherikover, Hellenistic Civilization...
Although this is a somewhat late caricatured and abbreviated version of the actual historical truth of what occurred, the result was perhaps also somehow related to the schism concerning the "wicked priest" described by sectarian Qumran sources such as the Damascus or Zadokite Document first discovered in the late nineteenth century in the Cairo Genizah. Relating this story of Onias and his brother priest to the prohibitions of Exodus 28:43 and Deuteronomy 22:5, Tropper argues (pp. 165-6),

In order to appreciate why Simeon’s plot met was with such resounding success it is worth considering how Onias’s inappropriate attire would have struck ancient priests and rabbis. From a biblical and halakhic perspective, all officiating priests had to be properly attired in priestly vestments when officiating in the sanctuary as Exodus 28:43 explicitly legislates: “They shall be worn by Aaron and his sons when they enter the Tent of Meeting or when they approach the altar to officiate in the sanctuary, so that they do not incur punishment and die. It shall be a law for all time for him and for his offspring to come.” In a similar vein, the Bible calls upon officiating priests to cover their naked bodies and the short gown, the “unqelah” was apparently a rather revealing undergarment “in which it was unbecoming to appear in public. Moreover, the girdle was not only an immodest garment, it was also a woman’s garment. Deuteronomy 22, 5 explicitly forbids cross-dressing and beyond this legal ramification of Onias’s feminine dress, the irreverence and immodesty it displayed would have exacerbated the affront in the eyes of the traditional religious leadership.

and the Jews trns. S. Applebaum, (Philadelphia and Jerusalem:Jewish Publication Society of America and Magnes, 1959), pp. 277-278; M. Delcor, "Le Temple d'Onias en Égypt" Revue Biblique 75 (1968), 203; Raphael Yankelevitch, “The Temple of Onias: Law and Reality,” in Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple, Mishna and Talmud Period: Studies in Honor of Shmuel Safrai, eds. Israel Gafni, Aharon Oppenheimer and Menahem Stern (Jerusalem:Yad Ben Zvi, 1993), pp. 109-110; Wasserstein (1993) 122-123; Erich S. Gruen, "The Origins and Objectives of Onias’ Temple," Scripta Classica Israelica (1997), p. 70. Although Tropper disagrees he does mention (pp. 160f) the view of Daniel R. Schwartz, “The Jews of Egypt between the Temple of Onias, the Temple of Jerusalem and Heaven,” Zion 62 (1997) pp. 5-22 in Hebrew, Daniel R. Schwartz has challenged this approach, however, arguing that Leontopolis was not nearly as remote as scholars have thought and if so, one might conclude that Onias’s temple was more significant than previously imagined. Furthermore, the fact that the Romans shut down the temple might imply that they viewed the temple as a potential flashpoint for revolutionary activity and this Roman fear would reinforce the notion that the temple was not merely a local affair. Schwartz’s evidence for the importance of Leontopolis, however, is modest and Josephus never links the Leontopolis temple to revolutionary activity. Indeed, closing down the temple may have been prompted more by Flavian propaganda and hostility to the Jews and less by any actual threat posed by the Onias temple. Moreover, there are other reasons which make it very difficult to imagine that Onias’s temple could have ever garnered widespread support. The biblical call to limit the sacrificial cult to a single location, i.e. Jerusalem, undermined the legitimacy of all other sites. The admiration of the Jerusalem temple in Judaeo-Alexandrian literature and the importance of pilgrimages to the Jerusalem temple for the Jews of Egypt make it even more unlikely that great numbers of Egyptian Jews would have supported and patronized the temple in Leontopolis.”
The name *Onias* was an attempt to Hellenize the Hebrew *Honi*, (a shortened form of the Hebrew *Yohanan* meaning “John” or “Yahweh has been gracious”), the name borne by the great-grandfather, father and son of Simon II. In Hellenistic circles, *Onias* (*Oνίας*) was apparently connected with the Greek word *onos* (*ονος*), meaning “ass”, which according to a popular belief, Jews worshipped.\(^{174}\) This shows the already existing second century B.C.E. apparent scepticism of members of the Hellenistic population towards at least some Jewish beliefs and religious practices. Those who were critical of the adoption of Hellenism by other leading families in Jerusalem seem nevertheless to have particularly respected at least certain Oniad high priests who proudly represented their ancestry as *sons of Zadok*.

The following proposed dates for the list of Zadokite high priests are adapted from Bruce\(^ {175}\), as mentioned in Josephus beginning with Jaddua - the last mentioned in the book of Nehemiah (12:22):

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Onias (I)</td>
<td>c. 320-290 B.C.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Simon (I) The Righteous/Just</td>
<td>c. 290-275 B.C.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Eleazar</td>
<td>c. 275-260 B.C.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Manasseh</td>
<td>c. 260-245 B.C.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Onias (II)</td>
<td>c. 245-220 B.C.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Simon (II - Tobias?)</td>
<td>c. 220-198 B.C.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Onias (III)</td>
<td>c. 198-174 B.C.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td><em>Jesus (or Joshua) or Jason</em></td>
<td>c. 174 -171 B.C.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td><em>Menelaus or Onias</em></td>
<td>c. 171-161 B.C.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td><em>Alcimus (non-Zadokite)</em></td>
<td>c. 161-159 B.C.E.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last three high priests, in italics and marked by an asterix (*), were appointed by Antiochus the king of Syria.

Perhaps the term Wicked Priest (Hebrew דַּרְשֵׁע הַכֹּהֵן; Romanized Hebrew: ha-kohen ha-rash‘a) in the Sectarian literature from Qumran was related to this tradition about Onias being deceived by his brother that is found in the Talmud. The sobriquet used in the Dead Sea scrolls *pesharim*, four\(^ {11}\) times in the Habakkuk Commentary (1QpHab) and once in the

---


Commentary on Psalm 37 (4QpPs), to refer to an opponent of the "Teacher of Righteousness." It has been suggested\(^2\) that the phrase is a pun on "ha-kōhēn hā-rōš", as meaning "the High Priest", but this is not the proper term for the High Priest. He is generally identified with a Hasmonean (Maccabean) High Priest or Priests. However, his exact identification remains controversial, and has been called "one of the knottiest problems connected with the Dead Sea Scrolls."\(^1\)

Although the interpretation of the historical context for Damascus Document’s original apocalyptic “code words” or sobriquets has been much disputed, why could not a scribe or even Onias III himself, have written in glowing terms about his difficulties in Antioch in a prophetic way relating to scripture? Indeed the Damascus Document adopts an apocalyptic theological cast rather than the wisdom proverbs of Sirach on the Zadokite high priest Simon II of a century earlier that is certainly more appropriate to the societal disruptions of Onias III’s situation. In this case, borrowing from Amos’ earlier prophecy, in ways similar to the book of Daniel’s “borrowing” from earlier prophecies which were perhaps instead actually written about the same time, this possible political stance for the Zadokite Document also adds further substance perhaps to why Menelaus might have wanted Onias III assassinated.

The most commonly argued-for single candidate is Jonathan Maccabaeus, followed by Simon Maccabaeus; the widespread acceptance of this view, despite its acknowledged weaknesses, has been dubbed the "Jonathan consensus,"\(^2\) More recently, some scholars have argued that the sobriquet does not refer to only one individual. Most notably the "Groningen Hypothesis" advanced by García Martinez and van der Woude, argues for a series of six Wicked Priests.

According to the Zadokite Damascus Document, God then raised up the Teacher of Righteousness, apparently a Zadok high priest, “to guide them [the faithful] in the way of His heart” (I). This Teacher of Righteousness and his disciples encountered opposition and hostility. Their adversaries, likely the Hellenizers, who were called “seekers of smooth things”(I), “removers of the bound” (V), and “builders of the wall” (IV, VII), were led astray by the “Scoffer” (I), the “Spouter of Lies” (VIII), the “Liar” (BI), likely either Simon (and/or perhaps later Jason) and then perhaps identified with succeeding Hellenistic high priests who were found to embrace perceived false teaching concerning the laws of purity and impurity, ungodliness and justice, as well as the temple ritual and calendar (V): The Damascus Document states that they were lovers of wealth (VIII) and that they stirred up civil strife (I). A fundamental concern of this text is the integrity of the priesthood and especially its privileged knowledge of sacrifices and otherwise hidden torah.

According to this classified military torah interpretative context, the Damascus Document thus means that Israel is the real spiritual community rather than the apostates who were becoming Hellenistic “citizens of Antioch” - and that Onias had been chosen by God as a member of the founding Zadok priestly family to be their righteous teacher. The text states symbolically that they repented at the point of the Seleucid victory and the subsequent erosion of their Hellenistic alliances with the Ptolemies and thus for twenty years they went...
“groping for the way”. Very likely this ideal was in conflict with the tax collecting Tobiad members of the Zadokite aristocracy who became the ancestors of the first century C.E. Sadducees. About that time, Simon the Tobiad conspired to let Antiochus III’s governor Apollonius know of the existence of funds in the temple in Jerusalem which led to the order for Heliodorus to go to Jerusalem to seize the funds.

According to 2 Maccabees (3) Onias reacted very honourably and righteously in trying to dissuade Heliodorus from trying to carry out the king’s orders to steal from the Jerusalem temple. When Heliodorus failed to heed Onias, according to 2 Maccabees, the Lord intervened and Heliodorus was struck down by a divine apparition.

After Onias III the father had gone to see Antiochus IV in Antioch about the Seleucid king’s requests for more money from the Temple in Jerusalem, the Zadokite high priest was displaced from the high priesthood in Jerusalem as part of the events leading up to the Maccabean War. Onias III became virtually hostage in nearby Daphne.176 It is unknown exactly when this request to build the temple came about but his exile may well have been both an opportunity and motive for writing works such as Daniel and the Damascus Document.

For example Rowley (1952) argued that the “House of Absalom” of the Qumran Habakkuk Pesher commentary could refer to Simon and the Tobiads.177 This series of events is thought by some to have been referred to as well by Daniel 9:27:

…"He shall make a strong covenant with many for one week, and for half a week he shall make sacrifice and offering cease; and upon a pinnacle shall be an abomination that desolates, until the decreed end is poured out upon the desolator.”

The Hebrew words wal-kanaf translated here as “and upon a pinnacle” is uncertain.178 The word kanaf literally means “wing”, “skirt” or, as here “the outermost (edge)” and thus is perhaps a reference to the architectural term kenaf ha’ares: meaning the pinnacle of the temple.179

Possibly his young son Onias IV may have been sent to the Ptolemies in Egypt at this time as a precaution. As long ago as 1948, Isac Leo Seeligmann considered Isaiah 19:18-19 and this connection to Onias in his doctoral thesis, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah - A Discussion of Its Problems. At the end of his chapter 'The Technique Employed in the Translation and its Relation to the Hebrew Text', Seeligmann stated with regards to the

176 According to 2 Maccabees 4:33 "When Onias became fully aware of these acts (of Menaleus), he publicly exposed them, having first withdrawn to a place of sanctuary at Daphne near Antioch.
178 The phrase “and upon a pinnacle” is translated in the NRSV as “and in their place”.
179 The LXX version of this passage is more pointed. It reads, … “And one week shall establish the covenant with many: and in the weeks of days, my sacrifice and drink offering shall be taken away: and on the temple shall be the abomination of desolation; and at the end of the time an end shall be put to the desolations”. ...
reference to the use of the noun ασεδεκ in the Greek translation of the phrase in Isaiah 19:18 rendered in English as City of Justice or Righteousness versus alternates in Hebrew of either 'sun' or destruction:

Nevertheless, there are certain considerations which appear to support the theory of the originality of the tradition as reflected in the Septuagint, i.e., עיר חצדק. It is hard to see, indeed, why the singular version חハー should have been replaced by the ordinary term חעזר; while, assuming an attempt on the part of the Egyptian translator to legitimate, with the aid of a tendentious correction to עיר חצדק, a sanctuary in Egypt as a City of Justice, on a par with Jerusalem (1.26) one would sooner expect him to use a Greek name than a transcription. On the assumption that the original version was עיר ח.Ptr, the explanation would be that in the Hebrew text a gloss had been inserted, at a later date than of the translator of the Septuagint i.e., חrze תבש ויר עיר, purporting to declare that it was Heliopolis which was being hinted at, which ousted the original עיר ח.Ptr. It must then have been a still later generation, which branded the sanctuary at Heliopolis as an illegitimate competitor of Jerusalem, that altered עיר חrze תבש to the ominous term עיר חrze תבש.

Ultimately it seems at least possible that there were textual variants for this passage in Isaiah even in the first century BCE.

Might there also have been some connection between the laudatory equation of righteousness to God in Isaiah 11:1-9 and the similarly laudatory description directed unambiguously towards the Zadokite high priest Simon in Sirach 50:1ff.?

---

### LXX Isaiah 11:1-5

A rod shall come out from the root of Jesse, and a blossom shall come out of his root. And the spirit of God shall rest on him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and godliness. The spirit of the fear of God will fill him. He shall not judge on the basis of repute, or convict on the basis of report, but he shall administer justice to a humble one and convict the humble ones of the earth; and he shall strike the earth with the word of his mouth, and with breath through his lips he shall do away with the impious. He shall be girded with righteousness around the waist, and bound with truth around the sides.

### Sirach 50:1, 5-8, 20-24

The leader of his brothers and the pride of his people was the high priest, Simon son of Onias, who in his life repaired the house, and in his time fortified the temple... How glorious he was, surrounded by the people, as he came out of the house of the curtain. Like the morning star among the clouds, like the full moon at the festal season; like the sun shining on the temple of the Most High, like the rainbow gleaming in splendid clouds; like roses in the days of first fruits, like lilies by a spring of water, like a green shoot on Lebanon on a summer day;...

And the wolf shall graze with the lamb, the leopard shall rest with the kid, and the calf and the bull and the lion shall graze together, and a little child shall lead them. And the ox and the bear shall graze together, and their young shall be together; and together shall the lion and the ox eat husks. And the young shall put its hand over the hole of asps, and on the lair of offspring of asps. And they will not hurt or be able to destroy anyone on all my holy mountain; because the whole earth has been filled to know the LORD like much water to cover seas.

Then Simon came down and raised his hands over the whole congregation of Israelites, to pronounce the blessing of the Lord with his lips, and to glory in his name; and they bowed down in worship a second time, to receive the blessing from the Most High. And now bless the God of all, who everywhere works great wonders, who fosters our growth from birth, and deals with us according to his mercy. May he give us gladness of heart, and may there be peace in our days in Israel, as in the days of old. May he entrust to us his mercy, and may he deliver us in our days!

Since the Book of ben Sirach, also known as *Ecclesiasticus*, has been found in Hebrew fragments at Masada, Qumran, and the Cairo Genizah (which had six
separate manuscripts), it can be seen to have been an important Hebrew work in ancient first century Judaism. However Sirach is not part of the later Jewish canon. It seems at least possible to have been perceived post-70 CE as having had sectarian overtones. If so the above excerpt from chapter 50 would likely have been a significant factor. Perhaps more than just the use of allegories and the personification of divine justice in a single sacred individual, there might also have been something here at least in a prototype form between these passages from Isaiah and Sirach respectively, for the characteristics of the Teacher of Righteousness as found in the sectarian texts that are part of the Dead Sea Scrolls? it would appear significant that some ten years earlier, Simon II was described glowingly by Sirach when he wrote to extol the virtues of the high priest and sons of Zadok in terms appropriate to the wisdom tradition emphasis at that time. If Sirach was writing apologetic to the advocates of Greek philosophy in his time, why could not a scribe or Onias III, have written in glowing terms about himself in the midst of his difficulties in Antioch?

We might still ask if there was originally a connection between sedek (צדק) and Zadok (צדק) for the authors of these texts and in the minds of their listeners. This becomes especially pertinent when we consider that in the Dead Sea scrolls literature the yod was often written Λ instead ofティ and that a shortened waw, ו, is nevertheless possibly considered to be a yod when it was not intended to be.

Emanuel Tov, in his important article, “Theologically Motivated Exegesis Embedded in the Septuagint,” made the following important statement concerning דיקאיו:

The identification of the root דיקאיו (‘to be righteous’) with δικάιο (e.g., דיקאיה—δικαίος) was accepted by most of the LXX translators because the two words cover each other relatively well. At the same time, this lexical choice has given rise to an interesting semantic development within Greek: in classical Greek the stem δικαίο- is used mainly with regard to the relationship between human beings, but in the LXX (as a result of its Hebrew source) it refers predominantly to the relationship between man and God. In our view, the special use of δικαίο- in the LXX does not reflect any theological tendency of the translators but is an inevitable result of the identification of the roots דיקאיה and דיקאיו-. This is an example of an equivalent in which many scholars have recognized (theological) exegesis, or a shift in meanings, while in our view the differences between the LXX and MT resulted from a process of lexical identification coupled with the technique of stereotyped translation. By the same token, it is not likely that the translators understood a different nuance in the meaning of δικαίοσύνη which

---

according to one scholar refers in classical Greek to "the virtue of human justice" and denotes "the mighty aid of God" in the LXX.\(^{182}\)

However it should be noted here that Tov does not consider the possibility that this human relationship connotation of the Greek δικαιο- when applied to the Hebrew root פעים- might also have been intended to allude to the human incarnation of the Zadokite high priesthood and perhaps also to the Teacher of Righteousness in a way that Christians later applied some of these LXX passages to the righteousness of Christ. The theme of righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) has an early connection with Christ that is worth examining here. For example the baptism of Jesus by John in Matthew (3:15) has Jesus state, "Let it be so now; for it is proper for us in this way to fulfill all righteousness (ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι πάσαν δικαιοσύνην)."\(^{183}\) This is an important connection between Jesus and righteousness at the very beginning of his biblical ministry.

For Jesus and Isaiah, we have again from Matthew (3:1-3)

*In those days John the Baptist appeared in the wilderness of Judea, proclaiming, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven has come near." This is the one of whom the prophet Isaiah spoke when he said, 'The voice of one crying out in the wilderness: 'Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.'"

Connections with Isaiah are mentioned again explicitly elsewhere. For the servant motif itself, Matthew 12:17-21 states

*This was to fulfill what had been spoken through the prophet Isaiah: "Here is my servant, whom I have chosen, my beloved, with whom my soul is well pleased. I will put my Spirit upon him, and he will proclaim justice to the Gentiles. He will not wrangle or cry aloud, nor will anyone hear his voice in the streets. He will not break a bruised reed or quench a smoldering wick until he brings justice to victory. And in his name the Gentiles will hope."

After the Markan and Lukan parallel accounts of Jesus’ subsequent teaching in the synagogue at Capernaum and the healing of Peter’s mother-in-law and of others, Matthew’s gospel (8:17) cites from Isaiah (53:4), as a substantiating comment:

*This was to fulfill what was spoken by the prophet Isaiah, “He took our infirmities and bore our diseases.”

---


\(^{183}\) See also Matthew 5:6, 20; 6:33; and 21:32 and many references in Paul, as well as Acts 13:10 and 17:31.
Matthew makes nine references to Isaiah as compared to one other in Luke and four in John. In addition, Matthew shares one reference with Mark and two with both Mark and Luke. There is also one sharing uniquely between Luke and Matthew.\(^\text{184}\)

In their parallel accounts, both Mark and Luke then speak of Jesus rising early to pray but only Luke makes use of the expression *good news* (4:43-44):\(^\text{185}\)

*But he said to them, “I must proclaim the good news of the kingdom of God to the other cities also; for I was sent for this purpose.”*

Significantly it is in Luke 4:17-21 that there is the one reference to Jesus reading scripture, here also from Isaiah:

> and the scroll of the prophet Isaiah was given to him. He unrolled the scroll and found the place where it was written: “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to bring good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to let the oppressed go free, to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favor.” And he rolled up the scroll, gave it back to the attendant, and sat down. The eyes of all in the synagogue were fixed on him. Then he began to say to them, “Today this scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing.”

Perhaps this interpretation of the Zadokite high priesthood as the Servant of Isaiah in terms of themselves might also help explain the extremely hostile synagogue reaction afterwards (Luke 4:22-29).

Just as ‘city of the sun’ was possibly changed in later tradition to ‘city of destruction’ it may be seen that it suited both Christian and later Jewish traditions to make a clearer distinction between Zadok and ‘righteousness’. Although the text of the Qumran pesher texts on Isaiah are perhaps too fragmentary to give hard evidence from contemporary times, there are strong further hints in what does remain that there was a link between the sons of Zadok, the Teacher of Righteousness and these passages of Isaiah.

For example fragment 7 of 4Q161 (4QpIsa\(^a\)) is very fragmentary for the important passage to Christian origins Isaiah 11:1-5, with the commentary missing before and after this somewhat reconstructed passage:

---


\(^{185}\) Luke 4:43 uses the infinitive aorist middle verb.
14. [ vacat [ ] vacat [ ] ]
15. [’There will come forth a shoot from the stub[mp of Jesse, and a branch [will grow] out of [his] roots. And] on him [will re]st the spr[irit of]
16. [Yahweh, a spirit of] wisdom and understanding, a spirit of coun[sel and might,] a ‘spirit of knowle[dge]
17. [and fear of Yahweh, and his delight (will be) in fear of] Yahweh, [neither will he judge] by what [his] e[yes] see,
18. [nor will he deci]de [by what his ears hear,] but he will judge [the lowly with righteousness, and he will decide]
19. [with fairness for the poor of the earth. He will smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips]
20. [he will slay the wicked. And righteousness will be the belt around] his [w]aist, and fai[thfulness (will be) the belt around his loins.’ (11:1-5)]
21. [ vacat [ ] ]

The missing part of line 20 contains הַצָּדָּק in the Masoretic text, here tentatively suggested in the translation as ‘righteousness’. It would be interesting to know if the absence of the missing commentary here, indicated by the vacat abbreviation, is a coincidence or if it was perhaps viewed later as false prophecy and intentionally destroyed. Maurya Horgan believed that “If more of the Qumran author’s interpretation of the description of the shoot of Jesse had been preserved, it might have given some information on the messianic expectations of the Qumran community.” Although it is now no longer universally accepted that such scrolls necessarily originated at Qumran, it would nevertheless give deeper insights into the theological interpretation of Isaiah at that time.

There are indications of a strong connection with Egypt in what has survived even for Isaiah. For example Hilary Marlow draws on the work of Miriam Lichtheim on Old and Middle Kingdom Egyptian literature to argue that Isaiah 19:1-15 constitutes a literary unit. She takes issue with those who have argued for its composition as a mere compilation of random oracles concerning Egypt. Marlow concludes that Isaiah chapter 19 has an overall unity and its author was aware of Egypt’s literary heritage. Marlow suggests the writer also had a ‘wide knowledge of Egyptian life, including a description of the Nile region and its religious and cultural significance.’ She states that the author of Isaiah was particularly

---

187 Ibid. p. 73.
aware of the drying up of the Nile. While this only suggests that the original Hebrew of Isaiah was strongly related to Egypt here, and it may be useful to look elsewhere for the Greek adaptation, nevertheless this does tend to indicate how Onias could have thought that he was legitimately using Isaiah 19:18-19 as a proof text. Very possibly it had been redacted by Zadokite scribes who had strong Egyptian connections.

Thus one wonders for Isaiah 30:1ff, which also relates to Egypt and prophecy, how the Zadokite temple in Egypt might have related to its prophecy since this passage explicitly warns against developing allegiances with Egypt and its leaders. Thus we find on the papyrus of pesher 4Q163 (4Qpap plsa’) that, although here again perhaps there are only tantalizing references and here too where it might be most interesting: the text is so fragmentary that little can be concluded definitively. However, the Teacher (moreh) and sons of Zadok are clearly mentioned in this passage but the phrase ‘of Righteousness’ if there is now missing:

Frg. 21
1. [ ]t [ ]
2. [ ] Lebanon is reckoned [ ]
3. [ ]/ to Carmel, and they returned [ ]
4. [ ] by the sword, as [ ]
5. [ ]sm [ ] [ ] [ ]
6. [ ]‘yn [ ] the Teacher[ of Righteousness]?
7. [‘And it was broken on that day, and] they [knew,] therefore, the humble of the flocks who [watch]
8. [me, that] it was [the word of Yahweh, ’ (Zech. 11:11?) vacat
9. [‘Woe to the rebellious children!–Oracle of] Yahweh–in making a `plan that is not]
10. [mine, and entering an alliance,] but not (of) my spirit, so that they a[dd sin]
11. [upon sin, in setting out to go] down to Egypt, and n[ot asking] my `opinion,
12. [in taking refuge in the protection of Pharaoh and seeking safe]ty in the shadow of Egypt[pt, but for them]
13. [the refuge of Pharaoh will be a shame, and seeking re][fuge in the shadow of Egypt]t will be an insult, for]
14. [his officers are at Zoan; and his messengers reach Hanes.
   Even[rything turns to shame]
15. [on account of a people who do not benefit them, neither] ‘for h[el]p nor for [profit’ (30:1-5)]

Frg. 22
1. [The interpretation of the passage[ ]
2. [m who walked[ ]

3. ] the Sons of Zadok [  
4. and whe]n it says, ‘Grain, the pro[duce of the ground, and it will be fat’  
   (30:23)  
5. ] ʾm it[  
6. ] l[189

Horgan notes that when the text of Isaiah 30:1-5 is restored here according to the Masoretic text, “the length of the lines and the vertical alignment is not entirely satisfactory.”190 Thus it appears very possible that the Masoretic text was either not being fully used or that textual changes were present. Horgan also describes elsewhere how in general this pesher appears to make references to other prophets. Thus here, for instance, there appears to be an allusion to Zechariah 11:11:

So it was annulled on that day, and the sheep merchants, who were watching me, knew that it was the word of the LORD.

Although we might be venturing down the slippery slope of conjecture at this point, it does seem possible that this reference could have been used here as a justification that Onias was in knowledge of the word of the LORD in establishing his temple at Leontopolis. Thus the text may have been affirming Onias in saying that his actions were indeed inspired by God and thus contrary to the general admonishment against alliances with Egypt in this passage of Isaiah. The question may still remain concerning the nature of a possible connection with Egypt, however, the papyrus as its writing medium may be an additional clue here as well.

Besides the issue of what constituted a true and a false prophet, there is also the question of what exactly the phrase sons of Zadok or sons of righteousness meant. For fragment 22.3 Horgan refers to 1QS 5:2, 9 and many other Qumran passages all of which have beni zedok (בֵּנִי צדוק) while 1QS 9:14 has beni hezedok (בֵּנִי הֵצֶדֶק). She says that transcriptions should indicate spaces before beni and after zedok. What did these spaces indicate? And why is there sometimes the Hebrew article and sometimes not?

As mentioned above, we tend unconsciously to follow the Masoretic tradition that consistent orthography and morphology was a given for ancient Hebrew scribes but, as we have already seen, the Qumran texts can show considerable variance from what has been thought based on much later Masoretic tradition. Like Isaiah 19:18 and the difference between π and π, the difference between a Hebrew yod (‘) and a waw (‘) can be both a subtle distinction in Qumran orthography and possible evidence of theological controversy in the later rendering of Masoretic tradition. They may represent now the perceived difference in sounds between “e” and “o” or “u”: Hence zedek or zadok representing ‘righteousness’ or

---

190 Ibid. p. 118.
‘Zadok’ respectively. But like the difference between י and י, it must be questioned whether such differences were in fact written and perceived as they are now in antiquity. The small difference between the length of the Hebrew letters yod and waw which can result in a Hebrew word being translated as either righteous (צדק or צדיק) and Zadok (צדק) may have had other implications. At least sometimes the yod is actually written Λ which would seem to increase the likelihood that an original shortened ו was still intended as a waw.

In assessing the evidence that now remains, it may also be useful to look at historical and cultural backgrounds possibly underlying the changes between the actual Septuagint and Masoretic text of Isaiah 30:1-5. While cultural and historical factors are difficult now to reconstruct, it is certainly evident that the ancient authors and translators and their audiences were aware of many subtle issues that now appear to have been of likely relevance in their own times of authorship. Since this text may (or may not) have seemed to argue against the actions of Onias building a Temple in Egypt, at least to some, it can be asked whether the translation of this part of Isaiah might be used to help judge whether or not this temple could have been the place of its translation from Hebrew to Greek? While on first examination there may appear to be nothing that could indicate such a bias, it could be argued that there is evidence for selective reposturing of the text by translating Zoan as Tanis and by rendering Hanes as ‘in vain’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masoretic Isaiah 30:1-5</th>
<th>Greek Isaiah 30:1-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oh, rebellious children, says the LORD, who carry out a plan, but not mine; who make an alliance, but against my will, adding sin to sin; who set out to go down to Egypt without asking for my counsel, to take refuge in the protection of Pharaoh, and to seek shelter in the shadow of Egypt; Therefore the protection of Pharaoh shall become your shame, and the shelter in the shadow of Egypt your humiliation. For though his officials are at Zoan and his envoys reach Hanes, everyone comes to shame through a people that cannot profit them, that brings neither help nor profit, but shame and disgrace.</td>
<td>Oh, rebellious children, this is what the Lord says, You made a plan not through me and agreements not through my spirit, to add sins to sins - those who walk to go down to Egypt but did not ask me, to be helped by Pharaoh and to be sheltered by the Egyptians. For the shelter of Pharaoh shall become a shame to you, and to those who trust in Egypt, a reproach. Because there are leaders in Tanis, evil messengers, in vain shall they become weary with a people that shall not profit them - neither for help nor for profit but for shame and reproach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Could the Greek Isaiah here be addressed to the rebellious children presently in Jerusalem who did not support Onias in seeking shelter from the Ptolemies in Egypt? In verse 4, Tanis is seen as a translation of the Hebrew Zoan. This word does not appear in what survives of

Josephus and the Dead Sea Scrolls
4Q163 so no comparison can be made with the Qumran text on that basis. However, the Septuagint also appears not to recognize Hanes, the Egyptian Hnes, known as Heracleopolis Magna in the Ptolemaic era, on the west side of the Nile, just south of the Fayyum. Instead the Hebrew hinna is rendered by the Greek as ‘in vain’. Was this just a mistake or an intentional redirection of the text?  

Tanis is believed to have replaced Pi-Ramesses/Avaris after the Pelusiac branch of the Nile silted up at the end of the New Kingdom c. 1070 BCE. Tanis had had major construction whose ruins still remain from the time of Ptolemy I Soter including a Ptolemaic temple whose ground plan is still recognizable apparently dedicated to Horus of Mesen, whose cult was on the island of Sile. Since Sile was where the Assyrian Esarhaddon had first attacked Egypt in 674 BCE, this may have been especially important to Isaiah and also to his second century BCE Greek translator. At the time of the Maccabean war and its aftermath, this reference may also have been a reminder of the ongoing threat of the Seleucids and their ties with Assyria. Certainly the possible allusion to Zechariah 11:11 discussed above in 4Q163 appears very relevant. Could this have been a further defense for the theology Onias developed around going to Egypt and building his temple there in the face of a plain interpretation of Isaiah 30:1-5? 

The Hebrew word moreh (מורה) translated as Teacher and used just before the statement paralleling Zechariah 11:11 in 4Q163 is also important to further investigate. Moreh is almost unique to the expression Teacher of Righteousness in the sectarian Qumran literature. It is used twice further down in Isaiah 30:20 which is preceded in the Isaiah

---

191 In Greco-Roman times Heracleopolis was capital of the Heracleopolitan Nome. Besides being generally recognized in Egyptian theology as having preserved the right leg of Osiris, according to several texts from the Ptolemaic period, the high priest of Heracleopolis held the title “King of Upper Egypt”. Perhaps the translator of the Old Greek Isaiah wanted to avoid this issue for some reason. Maybe it was believed that Heracleopolis would raise issues or detract from the intended message. For example it would have been unlikely for the Judeans of that era to have sought an alliance or at least politically incorrect to have suggested such a possible alliance to the Ptolemies. Alternatively the original Hebrew may simply have been different or corrupted.

192 Frederico Poole, “Tanis (San el-Hagar)” IN Kathryn A. Bard, Steven Blake Schubert, eds, *Encyclopaedia of the Archaeology of Ancient Egypt*, (London and New York: Routledge, 1999), pp. 755-757. A so-called temple to Anat, the Canaanite goddess of war has been excavated at Tanis - although more likely primarily it was dedicated to Mut and Khonsu Pachered. As well there was a principal temple to Amen.


194 מורה is used some 30 times in the Dead Sea Scrolls literature, counting 5 times in the Damascus Covenant of which 4 of the uses below are parallels: CD 1:11 ; 19:35 ; 20:1, 28, 32 ; 1QpHab 1:13 ; 2:2 ; 5:10 ; 7:4 ; 8:2 ; 9:9 ; 11:5 ; (12:11 – false teaching: ) ; 1Q14 f8_10:6 ; 4Q163 f21:6 (only has assumed); (quotation of Isaiah 30:19-20 inferred two uses in f23ii:17) ; (4Q167 f5_6:2 has only מורה between two lacunae); 4Q171 f1+3_4iii:15 has only the article of מורה, (verse 19 also has מורה assumed); f3_10iv:27 (has מורה assumed); 4Q172 f7:1 (מורה assumed?); 4Q173 f1:4 ; f2:2 ; (only assumed in 4Q266 f2i:14 but parallel to Damascus Covenant 1:11); (only assumed in 4Q267 f3:7 but parallel to Damascus Covenant 20:28); (only assumed in 4Q268 f1:17 but parallel to Damascus Covenant 1:11); (only partially assumed in 4Q270
Pesher from Qumran with an interpretation of verses 30:15-18 as it follows in 4Q163 (Fragment 23 Column 2):

10. The interpretation of the passage (with regard) to the latter days concerns the congregation of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things
11. who are in Jerusalem h [ ]
12. in the Torah, and not yh[ ] [ ]
13. heart, for to trample [ ]
14. ‘As the raiders lie in wait for a man, [a band of priests’ (Hos. 6:9?) ]` they have rejected the Torah.
15. ‘For, O people in Zion, [who dwell in Jerusalem, surely you shall not weep (anymore). He will certainly be gracious to you at the sound of]
16. your cry. When he hear[s], he will answer you. And (though) the Lord gives you the bread of affliction and the water of oppression,]
17. [your teacher] will no lon[ger] hide himself. [And your eyes will see your ‘teacher,]
18. and your ears will h[ear a word behind you, saying “This is the way; walk in `it]
19. when you would turn [to the right or turn to the left.” (30:19-20) ]
20. concerning the iniquity of [ ]

The word moreh (מורה) is used in various ways in the Hebrew bible. As well as being translated as ‘teacher’, in Genesis 12:6 it is translated as a place: the ‘oak of Moreh’. It is also translated as ‘razor’ in Judges 13:5; 16:17 and 1 Samuel 1:11 in contexts which relate to a Nazarite. Very likely the Genesis 12:6-7 use would have been considered very significant by the Zadokites in Egypt because of its expression of a covenant and also the statement about building an altar which might also connect with the prophetic stance of the Temple Scroll:

Abram passed through the land to the place at Shechem, to the oak of Moreh. At that time the Canaanites were in the land. Then the LORD appeared to Abram, and said, “To your offspring I will give this land.” So he built there an altar to the LORD, who had appeared to him.

According to Ewing, the Hiph’il participle from the Hebrew yarah means ‘teacher’ or ‘one who gives direction’:

Sitting in the shelter of a sacred tree, the priest or seer delivered his direction or

---

f2i:2 but parallel to Damascus Covenant 20:32); (non-canonical psalms 4Q381 f1:1; (בָּמֶרֶד פִּסְפָּס 1:1); and finally from the beginning of column two of what is left of the account of the Heavenly Prince Melchizedek, 11Q13 2:5 we have a reference to ‘his teachers’. בָּמֶרֶד פִּסְפָּס.

‘oracles.’ 1. *The oak (AV, wrongly ‘plain’) of Moreh* … may have been so named from the theophany vouchsafed to Abraham there.¹⁹⁶

*Moreh* is also translated as meaning ‘shoot’ or ‘pour’. In the context of the Assyrian governance of Israel, 2 Kings 17:26-28 uses its meaning as 'teacher':

So the king of Assyria was told, "The nations that you have carried away and placed in the cities of Samaria do not know the law of the god of the land; therefore he has sent lions among them; they are killing them, because they do not know the law of the god of the land." ²⁷ Then the king of Assyria commanded, "Send there one of the priests whom you carried away from there; let him go and live there, and teach them the law of the god of the land." ²⁸ So one of the priests whom they had carried away from Samaria came and lived in Bethel; he taught (מורה) them how they should worship the LORD.

*Moreh* is also applied to a false prophet in Isaiah 9:14:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew Isaiah 9:11-16</th>
<th>Greek Isaiah 9:11(10) - 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>So the LORD raised adversaries against them, and stirred up their enemies, the Arameans on the east and the Philistines on the west, and they devoured Israel with open mouth. For all this his anger has not turned away; his hand is stretched out still. The people did not turn to him who struck them, or seek the LORD of hosts. So the LORD cut off from Israel head and tail, palm branch and reed in one day-- elders and dignitaries are the head, and prophets who teach lies are the tail;</td>
<td>And God will strike those who rise up against them on Mount Sion, and he will scatter their enemies, Syria from the rising of the sun and the Greeks from the setting of the sun— those who devour Israel with open mouth. For all this his anger has not turned away, but his hand is still uplifted. And the people did not turn back until they were smitten, and they did not seek the Lord. So the Lord took away from Israel head and tail, great and small in one day—the elder and those who admire persons: this is the first part, and the prophet who teaches lawless things: this one is the tail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfortunately the pesher for this portion of Isaiah has also not survived but it is interesting to our investigation here that the Septuagint speaks in terms of the Syrurians (Συρίας) and the Greeks (Ελληνας) instead of the Hebrew text references to Aram and Philistines.

If we look at other Qumran sectarian passages, such as 4Q171 (4QpPs³) also translated by

---

¹⁹⁶ W. Ewing, “Moreh” IN James Hastings, Frederick C. Grant, H.H. Rowley, eds, *Dictionary of the Bible* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, revised ed. 1963), p. 674. Ewing gives further examples for Deuteronomy 11:30; which may also have been related to Genesis 35:4; Joshua 24:26 and possibly Judges 9:6. Ewing gives further discussion to the possible location for the Judges 7:1 location as well.
Horgan, we see further prophetic proclamations that must have been made originally by someone with some considerable theological authority. For example citing from Psalm 37 we see:

14. For ‘from Yahweh are the steps of man. They are established `and he delights in his way, for if he should change, he would not be hurled down for Yahweh supports his hand.’ (37:23-24)] Its interpretation concerns the Priest, the [Righteous] Teacher, [whom]  
15. God [chose as the pillar. F[or] he established him to build for him `a congregation of [ ]  
16. [and] his way is straight to the truth. ‘I [was young] but now I am `old, and [I have] not [seen the righteous one]  
17. abandoned, nor his offspring seeking bread. All the day long] he is gracious and generous, and [his offspring becomes a blessing.’ (37:25-26) The interpretation]  
18. of the passage concerns the [Righteous] Teacher, who God m[ ]  
19. and τ [ ]

Although the dating of the original Teacher of Righteousness is a controversial issue over which many views have been expressed, if Onias originated the doctrine, I believe the Teacher of Righteousness subsequently became a redivivus prophet. In the historical process of this I believe there developed reoccurring eschatological scenarios in a manner perhaps not dissimilar to the prophet Elijah as described in the New Testament (cf. Matthew 11:14; 16:14; 17:3, 10, 11, 12; 27:47, 49 and elsewhere) where the Teacher of Righteousness was continually being expected to reappear. However in Matthew Jesus is being compared to prophets whose orthodoxy was considered sacrosanct by the Pharisees and later Rabbinic tradition with the exception of John the Baptist. This tradition continued until the falsehood of this prophetic tradition and criteria for being considered a true prophet of God became widely recognized after the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE or even possibly as late as the Bar Kochba revolt.

Thus we have John the Baptist compared to redivus Elijah as Jesus says (Matthew 11:13-15):

*For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John came; and if you are willing to accept it, he is Elijah who is to come. Let anyone with ears listen!*

Still other redivus prophets, including Jeremiah and Jonah, are mentioned (Matthew 16:13-
Now when Jesus came into the district of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, "Who do people say that the Son of Man is?" And they said, "Some say John the Baptist, but others Elijah, and still others Jeremiah or one of the prophets." He said to them, "But who do you say that I am?" Simon Peter answered, "You are the Messiah, the Son of the living God." And Jesus answered him, "Blessed are you, Simon son of Jonah! For flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father in heaven.

However for the Dead Sea Scrolls sectarian literature if Onias III or IV was the original Teacher of Righteousness, he might also be well equated with a thus redivus Egyptian false prophet suggested of St. Paul by the Roman soldier in Acts 21:38 and described more fully by Josephus (Judean War 2.261):

But worse than this plague to the Judeans was the Egyptian false prophet. For a certain man pretended to be a prophet, and got together thirty thousand men that were deluded by him:

Although in both the passage from Acts and here in Josephus it has long been assumed that the Egyptian prophet was a contemporary of St. Paul, I believe that this can no more be certain than that Elijah, Jeremiah or Jonah were contemporaries of Jesus and the apostles. I think it may be that audiences in the first century knew only too well who the original Egyptian false prophet was and that this was related to Josephus' statements about the Temple of Onias in Egypt.

Theodor H. Gaster noted long ago, in his The Dead Sea Scriptures, after citing Moses as the original lawgiver as adapted in the Damascus Document for a new community:

The Torah—that is, the Divine Teaching (or Guidance) as revealed to Moses—has, it is held, been successively garbled and perverted by ‘false expositors’. The community’s main purpose is to exemplify and promulgate the true interpretation. It bases that interpretation on a kind of ‘apostolic succession’, begun by the prophets and continued by a series of inspired leaders each of whom is known as ‘the correct expositor’ or ‘right-teacher’ (not ‘Teacher of Righteousness’, as many scholars have rendered it)—that is, the orthodox expounder of the Word. The ‘right-teacher’ was probably in every case a priest, his title being derived from Moses’ farewell blessing upon the priestly tribe of Levi: ‘They have observed Thy word and kept Thy covenant. They shall teach Jacob Thine ordinances, and Israel Thy Law’ (Deut. 33.9-10).

---

198 Ibid.
William H. Brownlee, in his *The Midrash of Habakkuk* was sceptical of this *redivus* idea for the *Teacher of Righteousness* in terms of the Damascus Covenant, 19.35f (=9.29) and 20.13ff. (=9.39) which show that the Teacher of Righteousness was not considered a continuing office in the Community at Damascus. However if this was written while Onias III was in house arrest in Daphnae the tone of composition was likely extremely eschatological and apocalyptic rather than future oriented prophetic teaching. Brownlee also cited G. W. Buchanan who believed the term was *redivus* and that he had found a parallel to this teacher’s title in *Midrash Tehillim*, Ps. 102:18, which he translated as follows:

Another interpretation of *He will turn to the prayer of the destitute* [is this]: Rabbi Isaac- said, “With reference to the generations, they said that they had no prophet, no priestly teacher of righteousness, and no temple which would atone for them.”

The key phrase is *wë-lô kôhên môrêh sedeq*, which explained was an allusion to 2 Chronicles 15:3. In his translation Buchanan read as follows: “Many days for Israel there will be no true God, no priestly teacher (*מורה כהן* and no Torah.” On the basis of this passage, Buchanan deduced that *môrêh has- sedeq* designated an office which might be held by many different persons. The man at Damascus (mentioned repeatedly in the Damascus Document) who bore this title would be a different person from the man who held this office at Qumran. Although Buchanan saw this reference as addressed to the community at Qumran, I believe that it was intended for synagogues (or local communities which became synagogues) of supporters of Onias’ cause more generally. In later times, as the movement continued with their leadership in exile those who supported the Zadokites adapted to the Zadokite leadership who succeeded Onias. Josephus’ Zadok a Pharisee can be thus seen to fit with his subsequent statement that Judas the Galilean founded a ‘fourth philosophy’ that was an amalgamation of the Zadok and the Pharisees (Antiquities 18.23):

**But of the fourth sect of Jewish philosophy, Judas the Galilean was the author. These men agree in all other things with the Pharisaic notions; but they have an inviolable attachment to liberty; and say that God is to be their only Ruler and Lord. They also do not value dying any kinds of death, nor indeed do they heed the deaths of their relatives and friends, nor can any such fear make them call any man lord;**

Certainly we find both the Talmud, Josephus and possibly also the Septuagint translation of Isaiah and its Qumran pesher texts discussed above bearing at least some witness to a

---


201 Presumably the Essenes were non-Zadokite priest affiliates who followed the Sadducees in exile although they did not follow them to Egypt but rather remained in Judea or elsewhere. This controversial issue will be discussed further below.
connection between Isaiah and the founding of a Zadokite temple in Egypt by Onias, but is there further evidence this was connected to Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls?

The Hebrew expression *hesedek* (حسبק) as also found both with and without the article (*הסדק*) in the Qumran expression *moreh hessedeq* or *moreh sedek* (垛ק מורה) that has been translated as the *Teacher of Righteousness* since scholars began studying the Dead Sea Scrolls in the 1950s. We have posed the question as to whether there was a relationship intended or understood between *sedek* (צדק) and *Zadok* (צדוק) if both may originally have been rendered as *זדק* as well as in some Hebrew texts. Although the text of the Damascus covenant as it now exists from the Cairo Genizah was copied in the middle ages, apart from fragments discovered at Qumran, it may prove useful to examine how the two scribes who copied this text rendered *moreh sedek* (垛ק מורה):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Damascus Covenant I 11 (scribe A)</th>
<th>Damascus Covenant XX 32 (scribe B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image 2" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Medieval scribal copies of Moreh Zadok from the Cairo Geniza*

It is thus an interesting fact that at least in this later Egyptian tradition, the expression translated as “Teacher of Righteousness” in the Qumran literature may also have been a reference to Zadok or the Zadokite line as seen for scribe A above. Used without the article *he* in the medieval Damascus Document or Covenant from Cairo (垛ק מורה, in *CD* I.11; XX.32) as written by two different scribes.

The “Teacher of Righteousness” appears in the Qumran literature with the article *het* (垛ק מורה), eg. *IQpHab* 1.13; V.10; VII.4; VIII.3; IX.9-10 and XI.5 (as displayed here, from Brill, Leiden/Boston 2006):
As mentioned above, conventional Masoretic wisdom about ancient Hebrew dictates that the article (ת) is not used with a proper noun, and that Zadok would thus have been of course a proper noun.

However here instead of he (ה) we have het (ה). A brief survey of Pesher Habakuk (1QpHab) may help to put these issues into clearer context from the first century.

Was this a reflection of a difference in mere pronunciation and/or grammar or did it represent a theological difference? Further it may also be instructive to look at 1QpHab. 2.2 where the article has apparently been added later:

---

202 According to R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer Jr., Bruce K. Waltke, *The Theological Word Book of the Old Testament*, (Moody Press of Chicago, Illinois, 1980). Thus on the different forms, see Gesenius:§ 100. 4; on Dt 32:6, v. ינ, p. 210, **interrog. part.** (Biblical Aramaic and Targum י), Arab. י, prefixed, as a rule, to the first word of a sentence (or clause). **1. in direct questions**: a. as a simple interrogative, where the answer expected is uncertain, Ex 2:7 תכלא shalt I go and call thee a nurse? Ps 23:1 יכדרע will the men of Keilah deliver me into his hand? Nu 1:8; and frequently. b. often in questions, expressed in a tone of surprise, or put rhetorically, to which a negative answer is expected (= Lat. num?); Gn 4:9 יכדרע Am I my brother's keeper? Job 1:8; and frequently. c. it is used in questions which, by seeming to make doubtful what cannot be denied, have the force of an impassioned or indignant affirmation; Gn 27:36 (‘dubitatis speciem prae se fert Esavus, ut eo acerbius affirmet,’ Maurer, cited by Ges), 1 S 2:27 יכדרע Did I reveal myself to the house of thy father, when they were in Egypt? etc. (i.e. of course I did, although thy sons, by their actions, appear to belie it), 1 K 16:31 (expressing astonishment), 21:19 יכדרע Hast thou slain, and also taken possession? Je 31:20, 32:7, 17:10; after י c. 3:1, Hg 12:12; after ס יכדרע Dost thou see? Je 14:14 יכדרע כדרו a man dieth, shall he live? Occasionally, one or more words precede י (in the same clause) for special emphasis: 2 S 7:7, 12:21 היכדרע יכדרע for to God did one ever say...? Ne 13:27; Je 22:15 (א), cf. 23:26. d. in disjunctive questions, the first question being introduced usually by י c, the second by י; or (more rarely) י; see exx. under י 2 (p. 50). The disjunctive question may express a real alternative (as Jos 5:13), or (as esp. in poetry) the same thought may be repeated in a different form, in two parallel clauses (e.g. Is 10:15): in the latter case, the answer י is usually expected (v. p. 50). Only very rarely is the second question introduced by י; Ju 14:15 (where, however, י ought no doubt to be read, with MSS., Targum Be al., for א), or י Ju 18:19, 20:12, 18:28, 38:31.
Did the scribe simply forget to write the article? Is the added article the work of the same scribe or someone else making a correction? While the absence of the article א is generally used as a sign that the noun is a proper noun in Hebrew, א is actually used here as also appears at the end of the preceding moreh. Perhaps this is evidence of a poetic or perhaps local Canaanite style but could it be that a change in interpretation was also being introduced? Could the scribe have been copying from a text that did not have the article or was there some other intent?²⁰³

It has already been noted that in the bible righteousness (or just) is generally expressed with either a yod י or a following he ה. For example, in Genesis 6:9 the text says of Noah:

_These are the generations of Noah: Noah was a just י man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God._

Genesis 15:6 says of Abraham however:

_And he believed the LORD: and the LORD reckoned it to him as righteousness ה._

²⁰³ Matthew A. Collins, op. cit p. 127 gives considerable discussion to this part of Pesher Habakkuk. He notes the א both before and after sedek: הדריך "We must assume therefore that the use of הדריך was deliberate," Collins cites both Hakan Bengtsson and Blenkinsopp on the view that the final א does not change the meaning. Brownlee was of the view (1979, p. 55) that the change from 1QpHab 'for emphasis'. However the possibility also exists that the ancients were not as concerned about consistent orthography and spelling as modern scholars. It seems likely that the example of biblical usage variance such as between Genesis 6:9 and 15:6 (see below) was a motivating factor here. See reproductions from Brill of all the uses of the expression Teacher of Righteousness in Pesher Habakkuk plus a use from 4Q163=pIsa c fragment for comparison in Appendix below.
In *Mishnah Avot* (1.2) we find the Zadokite high priest Simon described as ‘the righteous’, again with the *yod*: *Simeon the Righteous* but what of the *waw* in Zadok?

The Community Rule (1QS) has various references to the *sons of Zadok*.

In *Community Rule* (1QS) Column V, we see now in translation:

1. *This is the rule for the men of the Yahad who volunteer to repent from all evil and to hold fast to all that He, by His good will, has commanded. They are to separate from the congregation of*

2. *perverse men. They are to come together as one with respect to Law and `wealth. Their discussions shall be under the oversight of the Sons of Zadok—priests and preservers of the covenant—and according to the majority rule of the men of*

3. *the Yahad, who hold fast to the covenant. These men shall guide all decisions on matters of Law, money and judgement. They are to practise truth together with humility,*

The original text for the expression translated as *Sons of Zadok* in the Damascus Document or Covenant is:

The specializations in modern scholarship between text criticism on the one hand and linguistic and historical interpretation on the other mean that scholars are not always looking at the original texts of things or fully understanding their linguistic and historical contexts but rather everyone must depend to at least some extent on the interpretations of other scholars. No one person can understand everything but modern technologies make it possible for much more access to the original texts as well as wider scholarship than was previously possible and modern tools can also help in making more informed comparisons.

Further down in Column IX, there is a statement concerning the *sons of Aaron* who shall govern the *Yahad* in judicial and financial matters and we are told that they shall do this until the coming of “the Prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel”. Verse 11 states that these are the instructions for the Instructor (‘משכיל’) who according to our modern translation of verse 14 “is to discern who are the true Sons of Righteousness *vacat*”. However, if we look at a modern Hebrew representation of this reference to *Sons of Righteousness* we do not get a sense of the challenge of discerning what the original text may have meant to its original author and audience as the letter written by the same scribe as above is now translated as if it were a *yod* even though it is clearly and noticeably difficult to distinguish
from a waw:

It seems clear here that the article is the determining factor but do we now correctly understand its original significance?

Since texts such as the Damascus document begin with a challenge to all who “recognize righteousness” (צדק), a possible connection with the so-called “Teacher of Righteousness” seems evident.

The original publication of the Damascus Covenant by Solomon Schechter, Documents of Jewish Sectaries - Fragments of Zadokite Work (1910), utilized the word Zadokite to describe what Schechter thought was the origin of this important Qumran text. Although an early suggestion was also made by Hans Joachim Schoeps (1956) to equate hesedeq with Zadok, the view expressed the following year by F.F. Bruce of the University of Sheffield came to enjoy virtually uncontested predominance among subsequent Qumran and Dead Sea Scroll literature scholars:

‘The Teacher of Righteousness’ is the name given in a number of the lately discovered Qumran documents to a man who was held in high veneration by the religious community on whose beliefs and practices these documents have thrown so much light. If he was not actually the founder of the community, it was certainly he who impressed upon it those features which distinguished it from other pious groups which flourished among the Jews during the last two or three centuries of the Second Commonwealth. So far as we can gather from our present sources of information, he is never referred to by his personal name in the Qumran texts. The title bestowed on him by his followers, 'The Teacher of Righteousness' (Heb. moreh sedeq or moreh hassedeq), may echo Hosea x. 12, where the prophet calls to his people: 'break up your fallow ground: for it is time to seek the LORD, till he come and rain righteousness (Heb. yoreh sedeq) upon you.' The RV margin gives 'teach you righteousness' as an alternative translation to 'rain righteousness upon you'; in any case, moreh sedeq is the participial form corresponding to the imperfect yoreh sedeq which Hosea uses. Numerous attempts have been made to identify the Teacher of Righteousness with some

204 Hans Joachim Schoeps suggested that his name was Zadok: that it was after his name that his followers styled themselves 'sons of Zadok' (Urgemeinde, Juden-christentum, Gnosis [Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1956], p. 74). I am indebted to F.F. Bruce M.A.’s 1956 Tyndale Lecture in Biblical Archaeology presentation at Cambridge published by Tyndale Press (London, 1957, p. 7, n. 1) for this origin.
figure or other mentioned elsewhere in Jewish literature; and as the career of the Teacher, in so far as it can be pieced together from the Qumran texts, is linked very closely with the careers of one or two contemporaries who are mentioned in equally allusive terms, it might be more accurate to entitle the present study *The Teacher of Righteousness—and others.*

For more than fifty years it has been commonly believed that the expression *Teacher of Righteousness* was unique to the Dead Sea Scrolls sectarian literature. But this does not mean that there are not references to this doctrine elsewhere. How can we be sure here as discussed above that the ancient evidence is being interpreted properly in our modern scholarship?

As mentioned above, Dupont-Sommer argued long ago that a scribal error changed an original reference to ‘Zadok’ or the ‘Zadokites’ in verse 22 of Josephus’ *Antiquities* Book 18 to ‘Dacian’, where the discussion has turned to a description of the Essenes. This passage was translated by Whiston in the eighteenth century as:

*They also appoint certain stewards to receive the incomes of their revenues, and of the fruits of the ground; such as are good men and priests, who are to get their grain and their food ready for them. They none of them differ from others of the Essenes in their way of living, but do the most resemble those Dacians who are called Cistiae [dwellers in cities].*

As Louis Feldman stated in his mid-twentieth century Loeb edition translation, “The manuscript reading, ‘from the so-called majority of the Dacians,’ does not yield sense.” Rejecting Dupont-Sommer’s actual suggested emendation of ZADOK, Feldman also yielded to the rationale of an earlier emendation by Abraham Ortellius and Joseph Justus Scaliger in the late sixteenth century. Based on a passage of Posidonius quoted in the first century Greek geographer *Strabo* (7.296). Posidonius had mentioned a tribe named the Cistiae who lived without their wives. According to this rationale the Greek *pleistois* was also “corrected” to *Polistais* and thus Feldman rendered this passage as:

*They elect by show of hands good men to receive their revenues and the produce of the earth and priests to prepare bread and other food (or variant good men, priests, to receive their revenues and the produce of the earth and to prepare bread and other food.) Their* 

---

205 Ibid. pp. 7-8.
manner of life does not differ at all from that of the so-called Ctiste among the Dacian, but is as close to it as could be.

While Feldman concedes, “It is true that Josephus has just said (v.20) that righteousness such as the Essenes possess is not to be found among any of the Greeks or the barbarians;” he argued that the comparison in verse 22 seems to refer to only specific aspects of their life such as their avoidance of wives and slaves and their communal sharing of goods. However, given that the very next verse refers to Judas the Galilean and his fourth philosophy which Josephus now tells us Judas established with no further mention of his earlier two mentions of Zadok in the passage cited above, I believe that Dupont-Sommer was right with his suggestion (1956) that the present ΕΜΦΕΡΟΝΤΕΣΔΑΚΩΝ or ΕΜΦΕΡΩΣΔΑΚΩΝ very likely originally had ΣΑΔΩΚΩΝ instead of ΣΔΑΚΩΝ after ΕΜΦΕΡΩ. It may be however that a later scribe accidentally transposed ΑΔ to ΔΑ or some other wording. Possibly the final ΩΝ was even an allusion to the biblical On which in passages such as Exodus 1:11

And he set over them task-masters, who should afflict them in their works; and they built strong cities for Pharao, both Pitho, and Ramesses, and On, which is Heliopolis.

Dupont-Sommer further argued that the original Greek pleistois (πλείστοις) in Antiquities 18.23 should be simply translated as ‘Many’ and thus related to the Hebrew term haravim (הָרָאוִים) translated as the ‘Many’ in such Dead Sea Scroll texts as the Damascus Covenant and the Manual of Discipline. Thus this passage might be more authentically rendered:

*They elect by show of hands good men to receive their revenues and the produce of the*

---

208 Ibid. p. 20 n. a.
209 Dupont-Sommer op cit. p. 363. While Dupont-Sommer argued a further connection to Sadducee here, I believe that Feldman is correct that such a lengthy corruption is “palaeologically hard to accept”.
210 Appendix 1 below gives two charts from Sir Edward Maunde Thompson - *Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography* (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1912) which give some indication of the challenges facing scribes in transcribing texts from the age of Josephus.
211 This translation is from, καὶ ἐπέστησεν αὐτοῖς ἐπιστάτας τῶν ἔργων ἵνα κακώσωσιν αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις καὶ ᾠκοδόμησαν πόλεις ὀχυρὰς τῷ Φαραώ τὴν τε Πιθωμ καὶ Ραμεσση καὶ Ων ἥ ἐστιν Ἡλίου πόλις See also Jeremiah 50:13 where ΩΝ was also a translation of the Hebrew Bethshemesh or Greek Heliopolis: He shall break the obelisks of Heliopolis, which is in the land of Egypt; and the temples of the gods of Egypt he shall burn with fire. - καὶ συντρίψει τοὺς στύλους ἡλίου πόλεως τοὺς ἐν Ων καὶ τὰς οἰκίας αὐτῶν κατακαύσει ἐν πυρί
212 Dupont-Sommer op cit p. 363. He suggests comparing to the following passages: Damascus Covenant 13.7; 14.7, 12; 15.8 and the Manual of Discipline 6.1, 7, 8, 9, 11 (bis), 12 (bis), 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 (bis), 18, 20 (ter), 25; 7.3, 10 (bis), 13, 16 (bis), 19, 20, 21, 24, 25; 8.19; 9.2. He states, “The passage of Josephus, we hold, makes a very definite allusion to this so typical word: it alludes in reality to the Essene community - governed by the Rule of Qumran.” While this association does not exactly equate to our present argument - the fact that Josephus is possibly making a connection to this Hebrew phrase here should not be ignored.
earth and priests to prepare bread and other food (or variant good men, priests, to receive their revenues and the produce of the earth and to prepare bread and other food.) Their manner of life does not differ at all from that of the so-called Many (πλείονες) among the Zadok of On, but is as close to it as could be.

The issue of righteousness relating to the Essenes as described here in Josephus may perhaps have also been related to the Teacher of Righteousness (המשנה - moreh hassadeq) mentioned numerous times in texts from Qumran. The phrase moreh hassadeq in fact appears both with and without the Hebrew article ha as we have already seen. Especially without the article it is also a term I believe could more accurately be translated in at least some of the Qumran texts where it occurs as ‘Teacher of Zadok’ which would then equate with what Josephus is saying here.

The issue of the relationship of the Essenes to Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls is a contested one. While it is difficult to establish what connection the ancient אסירים might
have had to the Zadokites, modern scholarship has discerned Sadducee connections with the Dead Sea Scrolls. For example in his chapter on 'Jewish Law at Qumran', Lawrence Schiffman has argued

*Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* has wide ramifications for the history of Judaism in the Hasmonean period. In the disputes mentioned in the letter, the opinions of the opponents of the sect are those attributed in rabbinic literature to the Pharisees or the Tannaim (mishnaic rabbis). When tannaitic texts preserve a Pharisee-Sadducee conflict mentioned in MMT, the view of the sectarians coincides with that of the Sadducees. For example, the specifics of the required state of purity of the one who prepared the ashes of the red cow according to our text (B 13-17) are mentioned in rabbinic sources as being the custom of the Sadducean priests in the temple (*m. Parah* 3:7; cf. *t. Parah* 3:7-8).214 This phenomenon can be explained by seeing the earliest members of the sect as Sadducees who were unwilling to accept the suppression of the Zadokite high priests in the aftermath of the Maccabean revolt (168-164 B.C.E.). Some of the disaffected Zadokites separated from the high priests in Jerusalem and formed the sect. The sect often refers to itself as “Sons of Zadok.” The polemics of the *Halakhic Letter* are addressed to their Sadducean brethren who stayed in the Jerusalem temple and accepted the new order, following the Pharisaic rulings, and no longer practiced the old Sadducean teachings. This document dates from the earliest stage of the development of the Qumran sect when the sectarian still hoped to reconcile with the Jerusalem priesthood. Later on, sectarian writings, having abandoned that hope, are filled with radical tendencies, animated polemics, and hatred for outsiders.215

As Schiffman notes, the Damascus Covenant and Community Rule have been seen as *torah* for the Essenes whether at Qumran or in various 'camps'. However all of this is to ignore the fact that the Zadokites were likely a different faction from the Maccabees during the course of the Maccabean War and possibly these works had a military purpose for their earliest use.

Yet all this is in the face of the fact that the first century Jewish historian Josephus makes important reference to Zadok in relation to Judas the Galilean and the census of Quirinius at the beginning of his *Antiquities* Book 18. Although this reference is apparently now so obscure that it is still generally believed by many modern scholars that there is no connection between the *Teacher of Righteousness* in the Qumran literature and the writings of Josephus, is this realistic?

---

As Schiffman notes, the Damascus Covenant and Community Rule have been seen as *torah* for the Essenes whether at Qumran or in various 'camps'. However all of this is to ignore the fact that the Zadokites were likely a different faction from the Maccabees during the course of the Maccabean War and possibly these works had a military purpose for their earliest use.

Yet all this is in the face of the fact that the first century Jewish historian Josephus makes important reference to Zadok in relation to Judas the Galilean and the census of Quirinius at the beginning of his *Antiquities* Book 18. Although this reference is apparently now so obscure that it is still generally believed by many modern scholars that there is no connection between the *Teacher of Righteousness* in the Qumran literature and the writings of Josephus, is this realistic?

---

214 Qimron and Streugnell, *DJD* 10:152-54


**FIGURE 1:** Herod Antipas governed the territories of Galilee and Perea. Drawing by Corey Kent, after Rousseau and Arav. The old pilgrimage route from Damascus brought eastern visitors to Gamla and to cities of the Decapolis like Hippos, Gadara, and Scythopolis before turning south along the Jordan toward Jericho and Jerusalem. It did not cross Galilee. Tiberias was sited to attract elite travelers into a pleasant detour west across the Lake into Antipas’ northern territory.
As alluded to above, it does not help that early editions of the Greek contained an amendment that seems less reasonable in view of subsequent discoveries. It also does not help that the eighteenth century Whiston translation of Josephus has Sadduc (in the Loeb translation of Josephus the Greek was rendered as Saddok) even though the Greek is the same word as Zadok that appears as translated in earlier books of the Antiquities. Could Josephus’ reference to Judas and Zadok be somehow connected to this Dead Sea Scrolls doctrine of the Teacher of Righteousness?

As mentioned above, in fact however, I believe that there was a connection between this reference to Zadok in Josephus and the Qumran doctrine of moreh sedek. I believe that a compelling case can indeed be made that there was just such a connection because I also believe the Judas also mentioned was the same Judas as is mentioned as the famous teacher of Sepphoris, the capital of Galilee, whom Josephus mentions earlier in Book 17. This Judas together with a certain Matthew who was later executed are said by Josephus to have been responsible for an important political incident where their theological students took down a golden eagle from the Temple in Jerusalem at the end of Herod’s reign. Both of these references to Judas in Josephus - who I believe were really the same person - are equated by Josephus with starting the events that led eventually to the Judean War.

Much like Jesus of Nazareth who was a teacher seen as a Galilean even though he was born in Bethlehem, as will be seen further below, this Judas at the beginning of Chapter 18 espoused essentially the same doctrines as Judas the Teacher of Sepphoris who is described earlier in Book 17 as the teacher whose students began the events which led to the Jewish revolt.

Josephus in his Antiquities (18.1-10) makes the following statement important to this discussion concerning a certain Judas and what many have believed to be the development of first century terrorism in ancient Judea at the time of the census and tax of Quirinius after 6 CE. It is important to note that part of this action was what Josephus describes as the amalgamation by Judas of the three existing Jewish sects of the Essenes, the Pharisees and the Sadducees/Zadokites into a fourth group:

Now Quirinius, a Roman senator, and one who had gone through other magistracies, and had passed through them till he had been consul, and one who, on other accounts, was of great dignity, came at this time into Syria, with a few others, being sent by Caesar to be a judge of that nation, and to take an account of their substance. Coponius also, a man of the equestrian order, was sent together with him, to have the supreme power over the Jews. Moreover, Quirinius came himself into Judea, which was now added to the province of Syria, to take an account of their substance, and liquidate the estate of Archelaus; but the Jews, although they took the report of a taxation heinously at the beginning, yet they stopped any further opposition to it, by the persuasion of Joazar, who was the son of Boethus, and the high priest; so they, being persuaded by Joazar’s words, gave an account of their estates, without any dispute about it; yet was there one Judas, a Gaulonite, of a city
whose name was Gamala, who, taking with him [προσλαβόμενος] Zadok [Saddok], a Pharisee, became zealous to draw them to a revolt, who said that this [Roman] taxation was no better than an introduction to slavery (ἀντικρύς δουλείαν), and exhorted the nation to assert their liberty: as if they could procure themselves happiness and security for what they possessed, and an assured enjoyment of a still greater good, which was that of the honour and glory they would thereby acquire for magnanimity. They also said that God would not otherwise be assisting them, than upon their joining with one another in such councils as might be successful, and for their own advantage; and this especially, if they would set about great exploits, and not grow weary in executing the same; so men received what they said with pleasure, and this bold attempt proceeded to a great height. All sorts of misfortunes also sprang from these men, and the nation was infected with this doctrine to an incredible degree; one violent war came upon us after another, and we lost our friends which used to alleviate our pains; there were also very great robberies and murder of our principal men. This was done in pretence indeed for the public welfare, but in reality for the hopes of gain to themselves; where arose seditions, and from them murders of men, which sometimes fell on those of their own people, (by the madness of these men toward one another, while their desire was that none of the adverse party might be left,) and sometimes on their enemies; a famine also coming upon us, reduced us to the last degree of despair, as did also the taking and demolishing of cities; nay, the sedition at last increased so high, that the very temple of God was burnt down by their enemies' fire.

216 Antiquities 18.4-10: Ἰούδας δὲ Γαυλανίτης ἀνὴρ ἐκ πόλεως ὄνομα Γάμαλα Σάδδωκον προσλαβόμενος ἠπείγετο ἐπὶ ἀποστάσει τὴν τε ἀποτίμησιν οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ ἄντικρυς δουλείαν ἐπιφέρειν λέγοντες καὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἐπ᾽ ἀντιλήψει παρακαλοῦντες τὸ ἔθνος ὡς παρασχὸν μὲν κατορθοῦν εἰς τὸ εὐδαιμονίαν ἀνακεμένης τῆς κτήσεως σφαλεῖσιν δὲ τοῦ ταύτης περιόντος ἀγαθοῦ τιμὴν καὶ κλέος ποιήσεσθαι τοῦ μεγαλόφρονος καὶ τὸ θεῖον οὐκ ἄλλως ἢ ἐπὶ συμπράξει τῶν βουλευμάτων εἰς τὸ κατορθοῦν συμπροθυμεῖσθαι μᾶλλον ἄν μεγάλων ἔρασται τῇ διανοίᾳ καθιστάμενοι μὴ ἐξαφίωντον τοῦ ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡδονή γὰρ τὴν ἀκρόασιν ὧν λέγοιεν ἐδέχοντο οἱ ἄνθρωποι προύκοπτεν ἐπὶ μέγα ἡ ἐπιβολή τοῦ τολμήματος κακῶν τε οὐκ ἔστιν οὗ μὴ φυέντος ἐκ τὸνδε τῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ περαιτέρω τοῦ εἰπεῖν ἀνεπλήρηθο τὸ ἔθνος καὶ ἡδονή γὰρ τὴν ἀκρόασιν ὧν λέγοιεν ἐδέχοντο οἱ ἄνθρωποι προύκοπτεν ἐπὶ μέγα ἡ ἐπιβολή τοῦ τολμήματος κακῶν τε οὐκ ἔστιν οὗ μὴ φυέντος ἐκ τὸνδε τῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ περαιτέρω τοῦ εἰπεῖν ἀνεπλήρηθο τὸ ἔθνος 6 πολέμιαν καὶ ταύτης ἐραστῶν ἐνέπλησαν ἡ πολιτεία ἐνίοτεν ἀνακεμένης τούτων αὐτῶν καὶ ἰσχυρῶς καὶ γιάννισαν καὶ ἰσχυρῶς καὶ γιάννισαν καὶ ἵππους καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχοὺς καὶ ἱππαρχο...]
While Feldman was following a tradition in scholarship that postulated Josephus was influenced by the ancient Greek historian Thucydides' civil war context stylistically in *Antiquities* 18.4-8, it is interesting to compare Josephus use of the aorist passive nominative masculine singular participle προσλαβόμενος with its use in the philosopher Epictetus' *Discourses*. Leaving aside the controversial question concerning whether or not the Epaphroditus of Josephus to whom *Antiquities* was addressed and Epictetus' Epaphroditus who was secretary to Nero was the same person, this aorist passive participle verb form (which is not found in Thucydides *Peloponnesian War* but also appears in a religious context in Josephus *Antiquities* 3.64 and of priests in Egypt in *Contra Apion* 1.241) surely makes sense in this discussion of different philosophies. Although our text of Epictetus was written from notes by his student L. Flavius Arrianus likely between 105 and 113 CE, and thus a decade or more after the completion of Josephus' *Antiquities*, it may nevertheless illustrate important about the philosophical context of Flavius Josephus' writings. In Epictetus the verb is directly connected with a hypothetical philosopher (Thomas Wentworth Higginson's translation 1890):

"τῷ ἀσυνήθει πρότερον φιλοσοφίας τοιάδε: περὶ ἡς ὀλίγα βούλομαι διελθεῖν ἄλλως τε ἐπεὶ καὶ τῷ κατ᾽ αὐτῶν σπουδασθέντι τοῖς νεωτέροις ὁ φθόρος τοῖς πράγμασι συνέτυχε

217 Relative to the last phrase of 18.4, Feldman states (n. a pp. 6f), "H. St. J. Thackeray, *Selections from Josephus*, 1919, p. 73 notes that the Greek is modelled on Thucydides 1. 122: defeat "brings nothing else than downright slavery" (ἀντικρυς δουλείαν)." Feldman further suggests sections 5-8 reminded him of Thucydides iii.82-84, "which has a similar context of civil war". He further cites Thackeray as well as Drüner who suggested an assistant wrote this passage but adopts the views of Petersen and Richards that earlier passages in *Antiquities* also show 'Thucydidean reminiscences' and suggests assuming Josephus was making an intensive study of Thucydides 'to improve his own style'.


219 For an overview of this verb in classical authors see,

220 Josephus uses the word φιλοσοφία five times in both Antiquities and Contra Apion but not in Jewish War or Vita where σοφία or the participle form of the verb is used instead. According to *Contra Apion* 1:54, philosophy is a major study for Antiquities: *Now, both these methods of knowledge I may very properly pretend to in the composition of both my works; for, as I said, I have translated the Antiquities out of our sacred books; which I easily could do, since I was a priest by my birth, and have studied that philosophy which is contained in those writings...*

221 Ronald F. Hock, ""By the Gods, It's My One Desire to See an Actual Stoic": Epictetus' Relations with Students and Visitors in his Personal Network " in : *Social Networks in the Early Christian Environment: Issues and Methods for Social History*, (1992) (Atlanta, Georgia Scholars Press,) vol.56, p.121. Although Arrianus' Epaphroditus is mentioned in passing without actually mentioning his name (1.9.29) (and elsewhere he is named) Hock laments that virtually all the students and visitors to Epictetus are unnamed. However he uses anthropological network theory to the information that is provided.
That some persons, failing to fulfil what the character of a man implies, assume that of a philosopher.²²²

It were no slight attainment, could we merely fulfil what the nature of man implies. For what is man? A rational and mortal being. Well; from what are we distinguished by reason? From wild beasts. From what else? From sheep, and the like.

Take care, then, to do nothing like a wild beast; otherwise you have destroyed the man; you have not fulfilled what your nature promises. Take care too, to do nothing like cattle; for thus likewise the man is destroyed.

In what do we act like cattle?

When we act gluttonously, lewdly, rashly, sordidly, inconsiderately, into what are we sunk? Into cattle. What have we destroyed? The rational being.

When we behave contentiously, injuriously, passionately, and violently, into what have we sunk? Into wild beasts.

And further, some of us are wild beasts of a larger size; others little mischievous vermin, such as suggest the proverb, Let me rather be eaten by a lion. [p. 1138]

By all these means, that is destroyed which the nature of man implies....

For what difference does it make whether you discourse on these doctrines, or those of the heterodox? Sit down and comment skilfully on Epicurus, for instance; perhaps you may comment more profitable [p. 1140] than himself. Why then do you call yourself a Stoic? Why do you act like a Jew, when you are a Greek?²²³ Do not you see on what terms each is called a Jew, a Syrian, an Egyptian? And when we see any one wavering, we are wont to say, This is not a Jew, but only acts like one. But, when he assumes the sentiments of one who has been baptized and circumcised, then he both really is, and is called, a Jew. Thus we, falsifying our profession, may be Jews in name, but are in reality something else. We

---

²²² ὅτι οὐ δυνάμενοι τὴν ἀνθρώπου ἐπαγγελίαν πληρῶσαι τὴν φιλοσόφου προσλαμβάνομεν. W.A. Oldfather in the Loeb translation (1925, p. 267) has, "That although we are unable to fulfill the profession of a man, we adopt that of a philosopher. Cf. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0235%3Atext%3Ddisc%3Abook%3D2%3Achapter%3D9

²²³ Here Oldfather suggested (n. 1 pp. 272f) that Epictetus is "speaking really of the Christians, who were in his time not infrequently confused with the Jews." However Josephus and his four philosophies of Judaism provide an interesting antecedent to this statement, especially given that Josephus in Antiquities 18.4ff.is lamenting the departure from the human ἐπαγγελίαν which Higginson translated as 'character' and Oldfather 'profession in ὅτι οὐ δυνάμενοι τὴν ἀνθρώπου ἐπαγγελίαν πληρῶσαι τὴν φιλοσόφου προσλαμβάνομεν.
are inconsistent with our own discourse; we are far from practising what we teach, and what we pride ourselves on knowing. Thus, while we are unable to fulfil what the character of a man implies, we are ready to assume besides so vast a weight as that of a philosopher. As if a person, incapable of lifting ten pounds, should endeavor to heave the same stone with Ajax.

The most important points to note here are what Josephus says about who and what it was that led to the Judean revolt. First it is important to note that he tells us there was a connection between theology or philosophy and the revolt. Although he makes it clear that it was an amalgam philosophy which developed, a challenging question for us now is: Was Zadok an obscure otherwise unmentioned living person as has often been apparently assumed or is this in fact a reference to the Zadokite doctrine which we have been discussing above? Also who exactly was Judas and what was Judas’ fourth philosophy?

FIGURE 2: The synagogue at Gamla, first century BCE. Top: drawing of the ruin, looking south from the hillside across the brow of the gorge. Bottom: reconstructed cutaway view, after a drawing by James F. Strange. This side of the synagogue, the north, was set into the hillside. The clerestory would collect sunlight from the exposed south side. The structure was 25.5 by 17 meters. The interior floor is 13.4 by 9.3 meters, surrounded by ranks of stone benches on all four sides.

Was Judas (or Matthias?) considered or did Josephus consider Judas to be a Pharisee usurper of a modified Teacher of Righteousness doctrine or more accurately according to this line of argument a Teacher of Zadok? If so what did it mean for Josephus to describe him as a Zadok Pharisee? Could this have been why the article was added to make hassedeq? Was there an intent to disconnect the Zadokites from the doctrine of the Teacher of Righteousness, perhaps because of the high priest’s encouragement to allow the Roman census? It can certainly be seen that Judas’ ‘fourth philosophy’ must have been a philosophy as religious or theological as the Essenes, Pharisees and Sadducees whom Josephus here presents next as the original three philosophies of Judaism.

It is evident that there are some things about this passage in Josephus which require further clarification from our modern perspective, not the least of which is what was the already existing understanding and knowledge of his audience. Importantly for our investigation we must ask if his audience already knew very much about Onias III and IV and their Zadokite doctrines. We must consider at least the possibility that this doctrine was so controversial that Josephus is only lightly broaching the subject in his Antiquities narrative.

Most importantly, if this Zadok was a reference to the so-called ‘Teacher of Zadok’, how does the man (ᾠδής) Judas here relate to the likely Zadokite high priest Simon and the other characters named Judas that Josephus mentions earlier in Book 17? Are they just separate individuals or am I correct that Josephus is explaining various characteristics of the same Judas? In this regard it is interesting to note again the already cited quote from Isaiah 43:6 in the Talmud Menahot critique of Onias:

Bring My sons from far, and My daughters from the ends of the earth. ‘Bring My sons from far’: Rabbi Huna said, These are the exiles in Babylon, who are at ease like sons. ‘And My daughters from the ends of the earth’: These are the exiles in other lands, who are not at ease, like daughters.

We must ask if this Talmudic reference originally had anything to do with what Josephus says about the influence of daughters in how Herod broke the Hasmonean tradition of High Priests in Jerusalem and how Herod appointed the high priesthoods of his time in general. For example, when Herod first married Mariamme, the Hasmonean, to help legitimize his claim to kingship, he also restricted the power and influence of the Hasmoneans, by appointing according to Antiquities (15.22), an obscure Babylonian high priest, Ananelus instead of a priest from the Hasmonean line. This was likely extremely controversial. However, later (in 15.40) Josephus tells us that Ananelus was from a high priestly family. Likely this priest was not therefore remembered as ‘obscure’ by those from Babylon who wrote the Talmud. This might explain the reference to the ease of Babylonian sons. Then sometime after Herod’s execution of Mariamme in 29 BCE, Herod made plans (Antiquities 15.320ff) to marry the daughter, who was also named Mariamme, of a well-known Alexandrian and likely Zadokite priest named Simon, the son of Boethus. In order to raise her to sufficient stature for marriage, Herod appointed Simon high priest. Later Simon’s son Joazar was appointed. Both of these presumably Zadokite high priests may account for why
a Zadokite sympathizing Qumran was abandoned during much of the reign of Herod as will be discussed below in due course. It might also explain why the doctrine of the Teacher of Righteousness was not disassociated from the Zadokites until the end of Herod’s reign.

In *Antiquities* (18:3) as cited above, Josephus states concerning the high priest Joazar’s response to the census immediately before describing Judas:

> but the Jews, although they took the report of a taxation heinously at the beginning, yet they stopped any further opposition to it, by the persuasion of Joazar, who was the son of Boethus, and the high priest; so they, being persuaded by Joazar's words, gave an account of their estates, without any dispute about it;

In *Antiquities* (17:339), Josephus had stated concerning Joazar’s dismissal by Archelaus after Herod’s death in 4 BCE:

> When Archelaus had entered into his ethnarchy, and was come into Judea, he accused Joazar, the son of Boethus, of assisting the seditious, and took away the high priesthood from him, and put Eleazar his brother in his place.

After Simon, Herod had appointed a Matthias son of Theophilus as high priest (17:78) who was not from Egypt but Jerusalem. However, according to the text of Josephus *Antiquities* (17.164), there was a connection through a daughter of Simon to whom Matthias was married since we are told elsewhere as cited above that Joazar was a son of Boethus as was Simon. Could these priests connected to Herod because of their daughters be related to our Talmudic account?

While the interpretation of proper names in Josephus can be problematic in general, I believe the question of the identity of Judas and possible connections with the Zadokite priesthood in Egypt is a place where medieval scribes found the classical cursive script of *Antiquities* especially hard to understand and their difficulties have contributed to what I believe are further confusions in modern texts and scholarship. An example of this might be the confusion over whether it was Onias III or IV who was responsible for constructing the

---

224 *Antiquities of the Jews* 17:78: The high priest's daughter also, who was the king's wife, was accused to have been conscious of all this, and had resolved to conceal it: for which reason Herod divorced her, and removed her son from his will, wherein he had been mentioned as one that was to reign after him; and he took the high priesthood away from his father-in-law, Simeon, the son of Boethus, and appointed Matthias, the son of Theophilus, who was born at Jerusalem, to be high priest in his place.

225 *Antiquities of the Jews* 17.164: But the people, on account of Herod's barbarous temper, and for fear he should be so cruel and to inflict punishment on them, said, what was done, was done without their approbation, and that it seemed to them that the actors might well be punished for what they had done. But as for Herod, he dealt more mildly with others [of the assembly]; but he deprived Matthias of the high priesthood, as in part an occasion of this action, and made Joazar, who was Matthias' wife's brother, high priest in his stead.
Jewish Temple in Leontopolis. I believe that modern interpretations beyond Josephus have also suffered from this confusion over proper names in transcribing texts from antiquity - especially with regards to what I have come to believe was Josephus’ “sons of Zadok” critique.

Jason's Tomb - a possible location for the Tomb of Zadok?
Minna and Kenneth Lönnqvist discuss the Tomb of Zadok according to the Copper Scroll (3Q15) as well as a possible connection with the Tomb of Jason.\(^{226}\) The possibility that what is described as Jason's Tomb might originally have been the tomb of Zadok and some of his family is representative of important possible connections with Qumran and Zadok that deserve further interest and deeper consideration. The more recent discoveries of the tomb of Caiaphas\(^{227}\) and of a certain Jesus son of Joseph in the Talpiot tomb\(^{228}\) demonstrate how problematic the identification of such important individuals with archaeological discoveries can be. Nevertheless a monumental tomb tomb to Zadok is indicated by the Copper Scroll and as such gives further substance to the importance of Zadok in the First century BCE/CE. Like the Lönnqvist's work on the solar calendar and a possible connection to Leontopolis, the evidence becomes more important once it has been adequately considered and investigated.

To evaluate further the possible roots of Josephus' statement concerning Judas and Zadok and its possible connection to the Zealots at the beginning of Book 18 of Antiquities it is worthwhile to examine earlier statements in Book 17 and in Josephus' earlier work, the Judean War, beginning with the following passages hitherto seen as describing another Judas and events which occurred just before the death of Herod. While the account in Judean War tells us clearly that Judas was a son of Sepphoris the reading in Antiquities was, I believe miscopied in the middle ages. There is also a reference to a certain Matthias, the son of Margalus [ΜΑΡΓΑΛΟΥ] in the Jewish War or Margalothus [ΜΑΡΓΑΛΩΘΟΥ] in Antiquities. While ΜΑΡΓΑΛΟΥ/ ΜΑΡΓΑΛΩΘΟΥ is generally seen as the name of the father of Matthias, could it have originally been a geographic name like Sepphoris in the case of Judas or a sobriquet that has perhaps not come down to us completely accurately? Could this name have been an important clue that was understood by Josephus' audience that is now lost to us?

The use of sobriquets in the Dead Sea Scrolls literature can be seen to be part of a wider usage of proper names in ancient Jewish literature and the society in which these names originated. For example in Matthew 16:16 and parallels, Jesus creates the masculine Greek name Πέτρος for the apostle Simon. Although Western Christianity associated this with the founding of the papacy in Rome as descendants of St. Peter, the possibility exists that the original reference was more likely related to the feminine Πέτρα which was then the capital city of Nabatea. John the Baptist had been beheaded for prophesying against the divorce of Herod Antipas' first wife who was a daughter of the Nabatean king in Petra, Aretas IV. Although few consider this now, Petra was renowned for its democratic government and had not at that time been captured by the Romans. From a Christian point of view there was

\(^{226}\) The Hidden Qumran, pp. 20-64.


only one narrow route into the city and most of the city was carved out of solid rock. The Muslim traditions that this was where Aaron's tomb is located and also Ein Musa where Moses struck the rock during the exodus are probably later than the first century but there is the important question of why Jesus switched from the feminine to the masculine Πέτρος in naming Simon since even as a simple name for Rock, πέτρα is feminine.

Tal Ilan, in her important *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity*, discusses possible Hebrew roots of Margalus/Margalothus in relation to Matthias. Although she mentions the view of W. Pape et al. that Margala (Μαργάλα) was a city in Elis Greece, she cites the view of A. Schalit that this is a reference to the Hebrew word ‘jewel’ (מרגלא). Further she cites Jastrow that the Hebrew for these two words can mean ‘jewel’ and ‘the bottom part of a bedstead’ respectively. However on the previous page, Jastrow also defines the word as ‘habitual saying, a familiar word’. Thus we find מרגלא translated in the Babylonian Talmud of *Berahot* (17a) after a citation of Ecclesiastes (7:1) concerning the importance of a good name:

> When Rabbi Johanan finished the Book of Job, he used to say the following: The end of man is to die, and the end of a beast is to be slaughtered, and all are doomed to die. Happy he who was brought up in the Torah and whose labour was in the Torah and who has given pleasure to his Creator and who grew up with a good name and departed the world with a good name; and of him Solomon said: A good name is better than precious oil, and the day of death than the day of one's birth.

> A favourite saying (מרגלא) of Rabbi Meir was: Study with all thy heart and with all thy soul to know My ways and to watch at the doors of My law. Keep My law in thy heart and let My fear be before thy eyes. Keep thy mouth from all sin and purify and sanctify thyself from all trespass and iniquity, and I will be with thee in every place.

> A favourite saying (מרגלא) of the Rabbis of Jabneh was: I am God's creature and my fellow is God's creature. My work is in the town and his work is in the country. I rise early for my work and he rises early for his work. Just as he does not presume to do my work, so I do not presume to do his work. Will you say, I do much and he does little? We have learnt: One may do much or one may do little; it is all one, provided he directs his heart to heaven.

> A favourite saying (מרגלא) of Abaye was: A man should always be subtle in the fear of heaven. A soft answer turneth away wrath, and one should always strive to be on the best

---

terms with his brethren and his relatives and with all men and even with the heathen in the street, in order that he may be beloved above and well-liked below and be acceptable to his fellow creatures. It was related of Rabbi Johanan ben Zakkai that no man ever gave him greeting first, even a heathen in the street.

A favourite saying (מרגלא) of Raba was: The goal of wisdom is repentance and good deeds, so that a man should not study Torah and Mishnah and then kick at his father and mother and teacher and his superior in wisdom and rank, as it says, The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, a good understanding have all they that do thereafter. It does not say, ‘that do’, but ‘that do thereafter’, which implies, that do them for their own sake and not for other motives. If one does them for other motives, it were better that he had not been created.

A favourite saying (מרגלא) of Rab was: [The future world is not like this world.] In the future world there is no eating nor drinking nor propagation nor business nor jealousy nor hatred nor competition, but the righteous sit with their crowns on their heads feasting on the brightness of the divine presence, as it says, And they beheld God, and did eat and drink.

Since these Talmudic uses of מרגלא are perhaps comparatively late, it is difficult to say what popular significance the term margala might have meant during the reign of Herod and to Josephus when he was writing about this era. Could it have simply meant that Matthias used a lot of ‘favourite sayings’? What about the more negative connotations of margaloth? For instance in Berahot (23b) we have:

Rav Joseph the son of Rav Nehunia asked Rab Judah: What is the rule about placing one’s tefillin under one’s pillow? About putting them under the place of his feet (מרגלותיו) I have no need to ask, because that would be treating them contemnuously.

This too is a late usage of the word. What is the connection between a word for a thing of beauty and a word that appears as a euphemism for sexual activity? A further study of Greek usage may be of some help. In Matthew’s gospel, the term μαργαρίτης is used in the teachings of Jesus:

"Do not give what is holy to dogs; and do not throw your pearls before swine, or they will trample them under foot and turn and maul you. (Mat 7:6 NRS)"

"Again, the kingdom of heaven is like a merchant in search of fine pearls; on finding one pearl of great value, he went and sold all that he had and bought it. (Mat 13:45-46 NRS)

The related Coptic term MAPГАΡΙΤΗϹ is found three times paralleling Matthew in the Gospel of Thomas (twice in Saying 76):
Jesus said, "The kingdom of the father is like a merchant who had a consignment of merchandise and who discovered a pearl. That merchant was shrewd. He sold the merchandise and bought the pearl alone for himself. You too, seek his unfailing and enduring treasure where no moth comes near to devour and no worm destroys."

And for Matthew 7:6 (Saying 93):

(1) "Do not give what is holy to the dogs, lest they throw it upon the dunghill.
(2) Do not throw pearls to swine, lest they turn <them> into [mud]."

According to Liddell and Scott, in Byzantine times margellia was equivalent to the word for ‘pearl’, margarites. From the third century author Philostratus (700) we have margelis, margelidos (μαργηλίς also meaning ‘pearl’. Perhaps this is connected to the Hebrew term translated by Jastrow as ‘jewel’. We still have the English expression, ‘pearls of wisdom’. It is certainly conceivable as a nickname for a teacher.

For many years the name Magariya associated with the medieval Kairaites Jewish sect has been a part of Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship. Could Magariya somehow be a slur or an elaboration on Hebrew roots of Margalus/Margalothus in relation to Matthias whose students removed the eagle from the Temple just before the death of Herod as mentioned by Josephus? Although Golb was sceptical of a connection between the Magariya and the Dead Sea Scrolls, he cites the work of the twelfth century Byzantine Karaite Judah Hadassi's Eshkol ha-Kofe which mentions the same sect. Although Golb was critical of Bammel's earlier view that there were other sources besides Qirqisani in Hadassi's work, both of these sources have numerous misspellings and textual variations. It is interesting to

---

233 Cf. Norman Golb, "Who Were the Magariya?" Journal of the American Oriental Society Vo. 80, No. 4 (October-December, 1960), pp. 347-359. Golb's 1954 doctoral thesis at the University of Maryland, "The Cairo Damascus Covenant and Karaita Literature," represents some of the earliest substantial Qumran scholarship. See also Eve Krakowski, "Many Days without the God of Truth": Loss and Recovery of Religious Knowledge in Early Karaite Thought," IN Pesher Nahum - Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature from Antiquity through the Middle Ages presented to Norman (Nahum) Golb, (Chicago: The University of Chicago, 2012) pp. 121-140 and especially her bibliography. pp. 136ff. http://oi.uchicago.edu/sites/oi.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/shared/docs/saoc66.pdf Norman Golb noted in his 1960 paper, "Who Were the Magariya?" (p. 347): "A tenth-century Qaraite writer, Ya'qub al-Qirqisani, states that the Magariya were called by that name only because books of theirs were found in a cave (Arabic magar); the Qumran manuscripts were also found in caves, and for this and a few other reasons which we shall presently examine, many writers believe that the Magariya were in reality the sect whose writings were discovered at Qumran-namely, the Essenes or at least an offshoot of that sectarian group."

234 Ibid. p. 348, n.2.

235 Ernst Bammel, Höhlenmenschen, Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, Vol. 49, Issue 1, (Jan. 1958), pp. 77-88. For example Bammel notes (p. 83) that one codex has מַגָּרִים מַגַּרִים but others have מַגֲרִים. http://www.degruyter.com/dg/viewarticle/j$002fzntw.1958.49.issue-
compare such name variations in spelling to those in Josephus for Margalus/Margalothus.

The earlier description of Josephus’ *Judean War* is are presented here in parallel so that his two accounts can be compared more closely. Note also the similarities in the theological rationale to the *Antiquities* 18 account of Judas cited above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judean War 1.648-652</th>
<th>Antiquities of the Jews 17.149-159</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There also now happened to him [i.e. Herod], among his other calamities, a certain popular sedition. There were two men of learning in the city [of Jerusalem,] who were thought the most skilful in the laws of their country, and were on that account had in very great esteem all over the nation; they were, the one Judas, the son of Sepphoris, and the other Matthias, the son of Margalus [ΜΑΡΓΑΛΟΥ]. There was a great gathering of the young men to these men when they expounded the laws, and there got together every day a kind of an army of such as were growing up to be men. Now when these men were informed that the king was wearing away with melancholy, and with a distemper, they dropped words to their acquaintance, how it was now a very proper time to defend the cause of God, and to pull down what had been erected contrary to the laws of their country; for it was unlawful there should be any such thing in the temple as images, or faces, or the like representation of any animal whatever. Now the king had put up a golden eagle over the great gate of the temple, which these learned men exhorted them to cut down: and told them, that if there should any danger arise, it was a glorious thing to die for the laws of their country;</td>
<td>There was one Judas, of Sepphoris [text: Σαρίφαιου, and Matthias, of Margalothus [ΜΑΡΓΑΛΩΘΟΥ], two of the most eloquent men among the Jews, and the most celebrated interpreters of the Jewish laws, and men well beloved by the people, because of their education of their youth; for all those who were studious of virtue (ἀρετής) frequented their lectures every day. These men, when they found that the king’s distemper was incurable, stirred up the young men to pull down all those works which the king had erected contrary to the law of their fathers, and thereby obtain the rewards which the law will confer on them for such actions of piety: for that it was truly on account of Herod’s rashness in making such things as the law had forbidden, that his other misfortunes, and this distemper also, which was so unusual among mankind, and with which he was now afflicted, came upon him: for Herod had caused such things to be made, which were contrary to the law, of which he was accused by Judas and Matthias; for the king had erected over the great gate of the temple a large golden eagle, of great value, and had dedicated it to the temple.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
because that the soul was immortal, and that an eternal enjoyment of happiness did await such as died on that account; At the same time that these men made this speech to their disciples, a rumour was spread abroad that the king was dying, which made the young men set about the work with greater boldness; they therefore let themselves down from the top of the temple with thick cords, and this at midday, and while a great number of people were in the temple, and cut down that golden eagle with axes. This was presently told to the king’s captain of the temple, who came running with a great body of soldiers, and caught about forty of the young men, and brought them to the king. And when he asked them, first of all, whether they had been so hardy as to cut down the golden eagle, they confessed they had done so; and when he asked them by whose command they had done it, they replied, at the command of the law of their country; and when he further asked them how they could be so joyful when they were to be put to death, they replied, because they should enjoy greater happiness after they were dead.

Now, the law forbids those who propose to live according to it, to erect images or representations of any living creature. since they would be both commended by the present generation, and leave an example of life that would never be forgotten to posterity; since that common calamity of dying cannot be avoided by our living so as to escape any such dangers: that, therefore, it is a right thing for those who are in love with a virtuous conduct, to wait for that fatal hour by such behaviour as may carry them out of the world with praise and honour; and that this will alleviate death such to a degree, thus to come at it by the performance of brave actions, which bring us into danger of it; and, at the same time, to leave that reputation behind them to their children, and to all their relatives, whether they be men or women, which will be of great advantage to them afterward. And with such discourses as this did these men stir up the young men to this action; and a report being come to them that the king was dead, this was an addition to the wise men’s persuasions; so, in the very middle of the day, they got upon the place, they pulled down the eagle, and cut it into pieces with axes, while a great number of the people were in the temple. And now the king’s captain, upon hearing what the undertaking was, and supposing it was a thing of a higher nature than it proved to be, came up there, having a great band of soldiers with him, such as was sufficient to put a stop to the multitude of those who pulled down what was dedicated to God: so he attacked them unexpectedly, and as they were upon this bold attempt, in a foolish presumption rather than a cautious circumspection, as is usual with the multitude, and while they were in disorder, and incautious of what was for their advantage, so he caught no fewer than forty of the young men, who had the courage to stay behind when the rest ran away, together with the authors of this bold attempt, Judas and Matthius, who thought it an ignominious thing to retire upon his approach, and led them to the king. And when they were come to the king, and he asked them if they had been so bold as to pull down what he had dedicated to God, “Yes, (said they,) what was contrived we contrived, and what has been performed, we performed it; and that with such a virtuous courage as becomes men;
preferred a death by a disease, before that which is the result of a virtuous behaviour. At the same time that these men made this speech to their disciples, a rumour was spread abroad that the king was dying, which made the young men set about the work with greater boldness; they therefore let themselves down from the top of the temple with thick cords, and this at midday, and while a great number of people were in the temple, and cut down that golden eagle with axes. This was presently told to the king's captain of the temple, who came running with a great body of soldiers, and caught about forty of the young men, and brought them to the king.

for we have given our assistance to those things which were dedicated to the majesty of God, and we have provided for what we have learned by hearing the law: and it ought not to be wondered at, if we esteem those laws which Moses had suggested to him, and were taught to him by God, and which he wrote and left behind him, more worthy of observation than your commands. Accordingly, we will undergo death, and all sorts of punishments which you can inflict upon us, with pleasure, since we are conscious to ourselves that we shall die, not for any unrighteous actions, but for our love to religion."

Josephus describes this Book 17 Judas as ‘of Sepphoris’ perhaps simply to connect this Judas with Galilee similar to the Gospels description of Jesus of Nazareth (which was likely a suburb of Sepphoris). Certainly a parallel philosophy can be discerned as relating to the Judas of both passages. What was the theology of this ‘fourth philosophy’ and where did it come from? Could it relate to the xenophobic militaristic theologies found in the Qumran literature? Josephus proceeds to describe how this initial relatively peaceful theological action eventually led to violent war and rebellion.

In an important recent paper, Eve Krakowski discusses Meira Polliack's critique of the idea of a 'direct nexus' between the Dead Sea Scrolls pesharim and Karaism. She discusses the phrase *moreh sedeq* (“true teacher” or “teacher of righteousness”) which appears with great frequency in both Karaite sources and (in the form *moreh ha-sedeq*) a number of the Dead Sea Scrolls. 236 Krakowski stresses the importance of evaluating the usage of this term in the light of its use in early medieval rabbinic Judaism. Two examples she cites for the phrase *moreh sedeq* are illuminating to our investigation:

The following remark, attributed to a second-century Palestinian scholar, appears in the medieval Palestinian midrashic compilation Midrash tehillim: “He heeds the prayer of the destitute [Ps 102:17]: R. Isaac said, This was stated regarding the generations, who have neither prophet nor righteous instructing priest *[kohen moreh sedeq]* nor Temple to redeem them ....”73 The phrase *[kohen moreh sedeq]* likely conflates the *kohen moreh* (“instructing priest”) mentioned in 2 Chronicles 15:3 with the common rabbinic designation *kohen sedeq* (“righteous priest”). Its use in this

---

passage calls to mind the Karaite historical conception of priestly instruction ... a conception that is also congruous with the priestly moreh ha-sedeq who figures in the Scrolls (and with the latter’s indictment of the Second Temple leadership).

Krakowski notes that several other rabbinic texts roughly contemporary to the development of Karaism employ the phrase moreh sedeq in quite a different sense, as a cognomen for the Messiah:

The term appears with this meaning, for example, in the eighth-ninth-century Babylonian midrashic collection Pitron tora. An anonymous Gaonic responsum characterizes this messianic moreh sedeq as resolving religious uncertainty: “May we and you and all Israel be privileged to bring forth traditions according to the law, and to establish matters truly, and to draw water ... from a clear source, when the moreh sedeq comes, in our lifetime and yours, and that of all Israel.” The moreh sedeq invoked here is remarkably similar to the moreh sedeq who appears in classical Karaite literature. In both contexts, the phrase indicates a messianic exegete who, at the end of time, will arise to determine difficult interpretive questions and restore the study of the law on firm foundations. This conception is in fact already attested in the Babylonian Talmud, where it is expressed by a citation of Hosea 10:12: until he comes and teaches righteousness [ve- yoreh sedeq] to you.

Of course the identity and exact role of the moreh (ha) sedeq in the first century is not entirely unclear either as we have seen above but remains a part of the challenge of discerning the connections of ancient sobriquets and biblical allusions more generally.

More generally Ilan writes further about the importance of nicknames for Jews during this period:

---

237 Ibid. Midrash tehillim cii.3 (ad Ps 102). According to Krakowski this compilation’s dating is uncertain, but it is considered to have achieved its current form in the late Gaonic period. She notes other rabbinic sources that reflect this conception of priesthood, p.128, n. 37.

238 Ibid. She cites Efron E. Urbach, ed. ספר פורה: ילקוט פורים ירושלים Jerusalem:Magnes Press, 1978: 339: “...until the coming of the moreh sedeq and the [messianic] future day [yom he-‘aïd]; on that day the work of righteousness [Isa 32:17] will be renewed in [the Temple].” On the origins of this text, see ibid., 11, 25. This reference is particularly intriguing, as the only extant manuscript of this work was transcribed in the fourteenth century in northeastern Iran, the region from which Daniel al-Qumisi emigrated to Palestine. See also the letter (of unknown provenance) attributed to Yohanan b. Zakkai, published in Eisenstein 1915: 215: “...until the moreh sedeq comes to redeem us and rule over us forever.” Harkavy 1887: no. 219. See also above, n. 36. and for b. Bakhot 24a. On the basis of a number of other rabbinic sources, Louis Ginzberg identifies the figure alluded to in this passage as Elijah (Louis Ginzburg, "An Unknown Jewish Sect," Moreshet Series 1. New York:Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1976: 212). For Karaite identification of the moreh sedeq as Elijah, see, for example, al-Qumisi’s comments on Joel 2:23 (Markon 1957: 29).
One of the interesting phenomena of the onomasticon collected in this corpus is the presence of many persons with a very common name, whose father's name is unusual, and usually not a biblical or proper Greek name (e.g. ששה בן חנני, ששה בן ששה). Sometimes the name of the father has a slightly derogatory slant (e.g. ננס בן יוסף = Simon son of Midget). I assume, with many before me, 239 that in these cases we are not observing a father's name, but rather a nickname, masquerading as a father's name. Of course, one can never be absolutely sure of this in any case. I have, however, out of skepticism, assumed in all such case[s] that a singular father's name is a nickname. All in all 188 such nicknames were identified in this corpus, most of them (122) belong to the group I have defined as "other Semitic names" … Since these names are usually inexplicable, and since one of the definitions of a nickname is its singularity, this should come as no surprise.

Could it be that something even more sophisticated was happening here in terms perhaps related to the Dead Sea Scrolls sobriquets? In terms of the Hebrew Talmud tractate Sanhedrin (19b, 69b, 104b), and the Mishnah itself (found in 108a), it is worth noting for example that in discussions relating to Caleb and the spies of Numbers 13.32 in the context of the Exodus from Egypt to the Promised Land, the masculine plural of Margulus, Margulim (מרגלים) is found rather than the original Hebrew word from Numbers translated as ‘spies’ (מרגלים), beginning with a reference to Psalm 1:5:

The ungodly shall not stand in the judgment, nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous: therefore ‘the ungodly shall not stand in the judgment’, refers to the generation of the flood; nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous’, to the men of Sodom. They [the sages] answered him: they will not stand in the congregation of the righteous, but they will stand in the congregation of the wicked. The spies (מרגלים) have no portion in the world to come, as it is written, even those men that did bring up the evil report upon the land, died by the plague before the lord. [they] died’ — in this world, ‘by the plague’ — in the world to come. the generation of the wilderness have no share in the future world and will not stand at the [last] judgment, as it is written, in this wilderness they shall be consumed, and there they shall die: this is Rabbi Akiba’s view. R. Eliezer said: concerning them it is said, gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice. the congregation of korah is not destined to ascend [from the earth], as it is written, and the earth closed upon them’ — in this world, ‘and they perished from among the congregation’ — in the next: this is Rabbi Akiba’s opinion. R. Eliezer said: of them it is written, the Lord killeth, and maketh alive: he bringeth down to the grave, and bringeth up.

I believe that it may well be significant here that the reference to spies here uses the term מרגלים which is also the term used in Egypt for Joseph’s Genesis 42 accusation of his brothers as well as for the spies sent by Joshua to the area around Jericho in Joshua 2:1 and 6:23. Possibly it is also significant that the term מרגלים is absent for this passage in the

---

239 Here Ilan cites Klein, Leshonenu 1 (1929); 2 (1930); Hachlili, EI 17 (1984); Naveh, IJE 40 (1990); Misgav, Tarbiz 66 (1997) stating further ‘although no one has ever formulated the rule exactly as I do here’.
Jerusalem Talmud, a product of the Galilee. Targum Onkelos for Numbers (13:2) uses יילון (yillon) which literally means ‘howling’ (eg. of beasts in the wilderness). While there are of course many references to torah (תורה) in tractate Sanhedrin, the Hebrew word for spy (תור) is never used. Surely this is not because the Rabbi’s did not know the correct term from Numbers. Since the same Hebrew letters (תור) can also mean plaits, circlets of gold, could it be that Margulus developed as a code for ‘spy’? The fact that Caleb represented an agent for the Israelites returning from Egypt to the Promised Land also seems more than coincidental here. Tractate Sanhedrin is concerned with torah relating to capital punishment. Considerable space is devoted to judicial procedure and to the composition of the various courts. The Aggadic sections discuss humanity’s place in the world to come and other fundamental tenets of faith. What is the connection between Margulim and the high priest in exile? Also if Margulus was an allusion to Elis in Greece, it seems significant that Elis was consecrated to the worship of Hades. Was this also a reference to the Oniads?

The passage of Mishnah which begins tractate Sanhedrin contains the following statement in which the reference to the evil Edah (עדה) is a reference to the twelve spies of Numbers 24:27; 34:24:

A tribe, a false prophet and a high priest can only be tried by a court of seventy-one. War of free choice can be waged only by the authority of a court of seventy-one. No addition to the city of Jerusalem or the temple court-yards can be sanctioned save by a court of seventy-one. … The Great Sanhedrin consisted of seventy-one members; the small Sanhedrin of twenty-three. Whence do we deduce that the Great Sanhedrin is of seventy-one? — it is said, gather unto me seventy men; with Moses at their head we have seventy-one. R. Judah said it consisted only of seventy. Whence do we know that the Small Sanhedrin is of only twenty-three? — it is said, and the ‘edah (עדה) shall judge... And the ‘edah shall deliver. One ‘edah judges, [i.e. condemns] and the other may deliver [i.e. acquit], hence we have twenty. But

---

240 For the reference to house of Joseph in Judges 1:23-24 neither the term מרגולים nor רון is used:

מָרְגוֹלִים הַקּוּבָּרִים אֶתְנָה מְדֻחָא אִָ֖מְרִי לְפָנִָ֖ים לֶֽוּז׃

241 Pausanias Elís 25.2-3: ή δε ἵερος του “Αίδου περιβολός τε καὶ ναὸς - ἔστι γάρ ὅδη Ἡλεῖος καὶ “Αίδου περιβολός τε καὶ ναὸς - ἀναίρεται μὲν ἀπας κατὰ έτος ξήαστον, έσκελθεν δὲ οὐδὲ τότε έφειται πέρα γε τού ιερωμένου Αἴδου Ἡλεῖος δε οὐκ ἔστιν μόνον οἰκισμόν “Αίδου Ἡλεῖον κατά αἰώνιαν οἴκημα. Ἡρακλείς στρατεύοντες ἀγαντάτῃ τοῖς Πάλοις τὴν Ἡλείαν, χαρακίζοντες οἳ καὶ Ἕλληνων συνεργάσιμον λέγοντον ἀφικέσθαι οὐκαὶ Πολυάγος τὸν “Αίδον συμμαχήσαντα τῇ ἁπέκχεις τοῦ Ἡρακλείας, ἐχοντα τῇ Πόλει τιμαῖα. 3 ἐπέγυνεν δὲ καὶ ὁ Γἴμηρον τῷ λόγῳ μάρτυρα ποιήσαντα ἐν Πάλαι Ἡλείᾳ δ Ἡλείας ἐν τοῖς πελώριος ὡς ποίστον, εὗτος ἡ τόσιος ἡ ἡ βασιλεία ἡ δύναμις τότες “Ελλήνων ἐπίκουρος ἦν, οὐκ ἂν ἂν τοῦ εἰκότος οἴε ο “Αίδον εἶδι δόξῃ γε τοῦ αὐτοῦ ποιητοῦ Πολύαγος αἴμων. Ἡλείοι δ οὐν ὡς φιλατρὶς οἱ εὐθύς καὶ ἀπεχθανομένως τρόπο τοῦ Ἡρακλεία ἁπαγαγοῦσα Ἡλεία τοῦ ἖θος έκάστου δὲ ἀπας ἀναίρεται τοῦ ἐναιστου νομίζοντος, ὧν οἴε καὶ ἀνθρώποις ἀπας καὶ κάθοδος ή ἐς τοῦ “Αίδου γίνεται.

JOSEPHUS AND THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS jimm.collins@utoronto.ca
how do we know that a congregation consists of not less than ten? — it is written, how long shall I bear with this evil ‘edah? excluding Joshua and Caleb, we have ten. And whence do we derive the additional three? — by the implications of the text, thou shalt not follow a majority for evil, I infer that I may follow them for good; if so, why is it said, to incline after the majority? To teach that the majority to ‘incline after’ for good [i.e. for a favourable decision] is not the one to ‘incline after’ for evil [i.e. for an adverse decision] since for good, a majority of one suffices; whereas for evil, a majority of two is required.

Although Matthias’ Margalus/Margalothus is written Meglothi in Latin codex A and in Codex Palatinus bibl. Vaticanus nr. 14, cent. ix or x the initial alpha is an epsilon Μεργαλόθου.242 beyond these textual variants I would like to suggest that especially for Greek-speaking audiences a possible original connection to the Alexandria area of Egypt may also have existed here. Possibly it might have some connection to the meaning of marglia and variants to pearl found in Greek, Syriac and also in the Rabbinic literature.243

The following chart has been compiled from a chart of first and second century Greek

---


243 The 1906 Jewish Encyclopedia http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/11971-pearl accessed Dec. 6, 2014 gives the following Rabbinic analysis,

Among the different Aramaic terms for pearl, מרגליות seems alone seems to be restricted to the pearl, while מרגלא, מרגלית, and the Hebrew מרגנית, are sometimes used to designate precious stones in general. Thus פטדה (Ex. xxviii. 17) is rendered מרגליות by the Jerusalem Targum; and זוהר (Gen. vii. 16), which denotes something to illuminate Noah’s ark, is explained in Gen. R. xxxi. 11 as being a מרגלית, by which term a brilliant gem is to be understood. The Rabbis had the notion that pearls are found in the interior of fish; hence the story of the tailor who observed the Sabbath and was rewarded by finding a pearl in a fish which he had bought (ib. xi. 5). The Persians were considered to be the best pearl-fishers (R. H. 23a).

The pearl was regarded as very costly; e.g., "a pearl that is worth thousands of zuzim" (B. B. 146a); "a pearl that has no price" (Yer. Ber. ix. 12d). Its beauty is proverbial. The coats which God had made for Adam and Eve were as beautiful as pearls (Gen. R. xx. 12); the manna was as white as a pearl (Yoma 75a). The pearl is one of the things the purchase of which is not subject to the laws of Ona‘ah, for the reason that the buyer of a pearl looks for a second one to match it (B. M. iv. 8; ib. Gemara, 58b). One reference, however, 'Ab. Zarah 8b, declares the pearl to be inferior to a precious stone, unless מרגלית denotes in that passage a diamond of inferior quality (see above). Pearls are designated also as drops: oil remained on Aaron’s beard like two pearl-drops (Hor. 12a; comp. Earring).

The pearl and its shell are used parabolically; e.g., "if I had not taken off the shell [lit. "the potsherd"], thou wouldst not have found the pearl" (Yeb. 72b). The term "pearl" is used metaphorically to denote any valuable thing; e.g., a good slave (Kid. 18a), or a halakah, or any reasonable interpretation (Hag. 3a and elsewhere). Sometimes it designates a prayer. "Rab and Samuel instituted a pearl in Babylon" (Ber. 32b), referring to the prayer beginning "Wa-todi’enu." The soul is in several passages termed "margalit" (Yer. Kil. ix. 32c; Yer. 'Ab. Zarah ii. 41a), which word may denote "pearl" as well as "precious stone." As a betrothal ring should be devoid of gems, there is a discussion concerning one containing a pearl, the opinion of most of the rabbis being that the betrothal in the case of which such a ring is used is binding (see Shuṭṭan ‘Aruk, Eben ha-Ezer, 31, 2).
cursive script alphabets from the first and second century CE compiled by Thompson (see appendix below) to give some indication of the difficulty for later scribes having to determine between these various Greek letters. Similar geographical challenges can be seen in such New Testament texts as the Gersene demoniac story in Mark 5:1 where different texts of this Gospel render the location variously as Γαδαρήν ὀς, Γερασίν ὄν, and Γεργεσίν ὄν. The early church author Origen (c. 185 - 284 CE) held that Gadara could not be the name intended in these passages and adopted the reading Γεργεσίν ὄν. In the case of Mark’s gospel these names are all actual geographical locations.\textsuperscript{244}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Cursive Alphabets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1\textsuperscript{st} CENT.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\alpha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\rho)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\gamma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\epsilon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\lambda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\omega)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\theta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\omicron)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\upsilon)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{244} Tal Ilan, *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity – Part I Palestine 330 BCE – 200 CE* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), pp. 438f cites W. Pape (G.E. Benseler), *Wörterbuch der grieschischen Eigennamen* (Braunscheig 1911) p. 859 who believed this was a reference to Μαργάλα in Elis, Greece but also A. Schalit, *Namebücher zu Flavius Josephus* (Lieden 1968) p. 82 and M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature* (New York, 1926) p. 836 who relate the name to the Hebrew מָרְגָא meaning “Jewel”. For more Ilan suggests S. Klein, “Notes on the Study of Names and Nicknames,” *Lēšonênu* 1 (1929) p. 345 (Hebrew). Ilan notes also that the Hebrew for an alternative reading is מָרְגָלָת which according to Jastrow means “the bottom part of a bedstead” apparently a euphemism for what Brown Driver Briggs translate as ‘place of the feet’. Ilan argues (p. 46) that since the ‘pool of personal names’ used during this period was fairly small, “Inventing nicknames solved the problem.”
In Greek and Syriac, the so-called *Hymn of the Pearl* shows a profound spiritual connection of this term to the core of belief and Egypt in early Christianity summarized by the statement (108.12).

*If you descend to Egypt and retrieve the pearl unique,*\(^{245}\)

Attridge notes that the neither the Greek nor the Syriac can definitively be shown to be earliest. Nor is the hymn stylistically related to the rest of the *Acts of Thomas*. Thus the possibility of an original Aramaic or Hebrew connection is not impossible. In so far as the apostle was Jewish, the text's author may have been documenting something that actually originated with the historical Thomas. Although the *Hymn of the Pearl* is only found rarely in the manuscripts - it is only found in one Syriac tradition and a minority of the Greek - it may be that it was omitted because it was considered to have heterodox association.

In Syriac the term is used symbolically of the eucharistic host as well as translated as 'pearl'

In *Berakhoth* 33b of the Babylonian Talmud, in the context of a discussion about the Temple Mount in Jerusalem, there is a connection mentioned between the Jewish *Amidah* and the Aramaic term for 'pearl', מרגניתא.

...but I only know that Rab and Samuel instituted for us a precious pearl in Babylon: ‘And Thou didst make known unto us, O Lord our God, Thy righteous judgments and didst teach us to do the statutes that Thou hast willed, and hast made us inherit seasons of gladness and festivals of freewill-offering, and didst transmit to us the holiness of Sabbath and the glory of the appointed season and the celebration of the festival. Thou hast divided between the holiness of Sabbath and the holiness of the festival, and hast sanctified the seventh day above the six working days: Thou hast separated and sanctified Thy people Israel with Thy holiness. And Thou hast given us’ etc.\(^{246}\)

An argument in favour of the above 'pearl-related meaning' might be in how durable the tradition of the Hebrew here in Josephus has been. Proper names were often abbreviated in ancient texts. Such different abbreviations were often difficult for medieval scribes to know how to properly copy.\(^{247}\) The fact that the Hebrew integrity of this name survived relatively...
intact in some manuscripts may be an indication that this name was known and deemed important at least in the early centuries.\textsuperscript{248}


\textit{Fig. 1: The location of Mareotis Island and the sites mentioned in text, modified from De Cossen 1935.}

\textsuperscript{248} In Michael Hardwick’s important \textit{Josephus as an Historical Source in Patristic Literature Through Eusebius}, there is analysis that has useful implications here. He considers the problem of the names of Egyptian pharaohs in the list of Josephus’ \textit{Contra Apion} (1.94-103) quote of Mantheo and also the chronology from Hiram to Pygmalion (1.117-126) as cited in the patristic author Theophilus of Antioch (\textit{To Autolycus} 3.21) who wrote some time after 169 CE and concludes:

Since Theophilus could follow Josephus quite closely and accurately, it seems likely that the discrepancies are the result of scribal error during the transmission of the text rather than an error during composition.

If there was a geographic intention to the reference, perhaps the otherwise unknown place of origin for Josephus’ Matthias may have been an abbreviated geographical reference such as well such as for instance Lake Maryut/Mareotis [ΜΑΡΙΟΥΘ instead of ΜΑΡΓΑΛΟΥ or ΜΑΡΓΑΛΩΘΟΥ] or the ancient port on Lake Marea south of Alexandria in Egypt. The Lake Mareotis Research project conducted an extensive archeological survey between 2004 and 2008 along the shores of the Lake west of Alexandria. The initial pilot survey in 2004 resulted in the identification of over ninety sites along an initial 100 km of the lake shore.

Modern Lake Mariut represents what remains of one of the most distinctive geomorphic features on the northern coast of Egypt. It was the only freshwater coastal lake in Egypt: fed by means of a number of canals, which branched off the Nile’s now-defunct Canopic branch and flowed into the south and east sides of the lake. Some of these canals were navigable, enabling merchandise to be transported easily to and from the hinterland. The lake was also connected to the Mediterranean through a navigable canal that entered the sea at Alexandria. Its connection to both the Nile and the sea resulted in the lake being a vital conduit of communication in Egypt’s internal transport system. Moreover, as a freshwater lake it supported around its shores various agricultural activities and embraced major production centres for different industries such as glass, pottery and wine, which contributed significantly to the economy of Alexandria and of Egypt as a whole.

Map on following page from Penelope Wilson, "Recent Work in the Southern Mareotis Area" IN Lucy Blue et al., Lake Mareotis: Reconstructing the Past University of Southampton Series in Archaeology No. 2 BAR International Series 2113, 2010, p 120. shows the two locations of a Tell el Magaeir.

---


250 The project was directed by Lucy Blue from the Centre for Maritime Archaeology, University of south Hampton and Sameh Rames from the Department of Underwater Antiquities of the Egyptian Supreme Council of Antiquities.

As pointed out by Mariane Bergman Michael Heinzelmann and Archer Martin, shortly after the foundation of Alexandria, the new Ptolemaic capital was connected to the Canopic branch of the Nile by an artificial 30 km long channel. A new town, Schedia (σκεδία meaning 'pontoon bridge') was founded. As well as a large Hellenic population, there was a Jewish colony as early as the time of Ptolemaios III Euergetes (246-221 BCE) with one of the oldest known synagogues. Possible connections with this Egyptian geography may now be impossible to prove but the Lake Mareotis Research Project survey results indicate how complex and extensive this network of Nile Delta communities once was.

However a non-geographical connection with Pearl as soul or the Amidah as a core of Jewish belief may well also have significant possibilities. The connection with Egypt in the Hymn of the Pearl of early Christian tradition is certainly worthy of further study. Although many have thought the Hymn of the Pearl to be a late addition to a late tradition about Didymus Thomas, what if this hymn was actually associated with the apostle and had roots in the already long existing divisions within Judaism?

The Greek term άρεσις originally denoted "division," "sect," "religious" or "philosophical party," and was applied by Josephus to the three Jewish sects: the Sadducees, Pharisees, and Essenes. The specific rabbinical term for heresies, or religious divisions due to an illegitimate spirit, was רולי (minim) (literally "kinds [of belief]"; the singular רומ (min) (literally, "a kind") for heretic or Gnostic was coined idiomatically, like goy and 'Am ha-aretz). An alternative term, מרדכי (Apikoros), which may have a different status, and was often used for apostates who turned towards agnosticism or atheism. It is said to have been derived from Epicurus and the philosophy of Epicureanism. Already by the time Onias III there were significant divisions within Judaism as we have seen.

According to the Mishnah the following have no share in the world to come: "He who denies that the Torah is divinely revealed, and the apiḳoros." R. Akiba says, "also he who reads heretical books". This is explained in the Talmud (Sanhedrin 100b) to mean "sifre Ẓeduḵim" (Zadokite or Sadducean writings); but this is said to have been an alteration by the censor of "sifre ha-Minit" (books of the Gnostics or Heretics). The biblical version, "That ye seek not after your own heart" (Numbers 15. 39), was explained (Sifre, Numbers 115; Berakhot 12b) as "Ye shall not turn to heretic views ["minut"] which lead your heart away from God" (see Maimonides, "Yad," 'Akkum, 2. 3).

---


253 See Maimonides, and his differentiation between different statuses in Hilchos Teshuvah.
The history of the origins and use of the Amidah have recently been studied intensively in terms of the Birkaṭ HaMinim (BH), one of the eighteen benedictions of this daily Jewish prayer. In her analysis drawn from earlier work with Uri Ehrlich, In Ruth Langer's recent comprehensive survey, Cursing the Christians? A History of the Birkaṭ HaMinim, she points out that from the Egyptian perspective of the Cairo Ben Ezra Synagogue, (where the Zadokite Document was also discovered over a century ago), with regards to the Hebrew term meshumadim, ‘destroyed ones’:

Every single geniza version begins ‘לָּמְשֻׁמָּדִים אל הָדוֹר תָּכוּ ה’ May there be no hope for meshumadim.’ There is absolutely nothing in the talmudic-era materials ... that would have led us to expect the universal appearance of this line or its prominence as the opening line of the prayer.

In his review of Ruth Langer’s, Cursing the Christians?, Adiel Schremer critiques the idea of interpreting the origins of the Amidah from a perspective based on later Geonic Rabbinic views:

Maintaining methodological rigor, Langer emphasizes time and again that “we cannot go beyond the data available,” and that “we need to be careful about overgeneralizing.” On the textual level, the most she is willing to say is that “the geniza evidence for the birkaṭ haminim reflects a liturgy in significant flux” (64). On the interpretive level, however, she seems to have something more important to note: “What emerges from the geonic world is a blessing that barely focuses on the minim who occasioned its initial composition” (ibid.).

And it is precisely at this point that Langer’s treatment of BH seems to have missed the point. For the very assumption that it was the minim who occasioned the benediction’s initial composition rests on an acceptance of the talmudic story about Shmuel Ha-Katan, whose value as a historical account Langer herself denies. If one refuses to accept the historicity of the talmudic story, why should one assume, in the first place, that the minim were the benediction’s initial focus? Simply because of its name?

---

254 Uri Ehrlich and Ruth Langer, "The Earliest Texts of the Birkaṭ Haminim," Hebrew Union College Annual 76 (2006):63-80, 99-106 which drew on Ehrlich's database of all available liturgical geniza texts. Langer states that their analysis considered four times the number of geniza manuscript texts of the Birkaṭ Haminim previously published.
256 Op. cit. p. 45
257 Adiel Schremer, Association for Jewish Studies Review / Volume 37 / Issue 02 / November 2013, p. 391
Similarly, Langer also states,

In most geniza versions of the *birkat haminim*, the curse of the *malkhut zadon*, the kingdom/empire of insolence, immediately follows this curse of apostates… This line, too, could not have been anticipated based on our late antique sources.\(^ {258} \)

As Schremer points out,

These gaps should caution us against rushing to conclusions about the text and meaning of BH in mishnaic and talmudic times, as our actual knowledge of its precise text is close to nil...

The use of sobriquets discussed above in the Dead Sea Scroll texts thus finds possible relations with other older terms based on Talmudic and other Jewish sources. Schremer discusses a possibly related Tosefta reference to the Pharisees (פִּרְוָיָם).

In one branch of the Babylonian text of BH the *minim* are not mentioned at all. According to the data given by Langer, this version is documented in far more Genizah manuscripts than any other existing version of the benediction (see table at 46–47). Sa’adia’s text, too, does not make any mention of the minim (57). This should have caused one to pause and wonder about the nature of the benediction and its target. Perhaps, after all, BH was not a curse aimed specifically against the minim? Perhaps it needs to be viewed differently?

The Tosefta (T. Berakhot 3:25), which preserves the earliest rabbinic reference to BH, rules that the benediction concerning the *minim* may (or should) be incorporated into another benediction, that is, the one concerning פִּרְוָיָם (the precise nature of which is even less known than that of BH, and is open to different interpretations). Already this suggests that BH is only part of a broader benediction. Moreover, if one accepts Saul Lieberman’s interpretation that פִּרְוָיָם were separatists, one would immediately notice other early rabbinic sources (such as T. Megilah, 3:37; T. Bava Mez.ia 2:23; T. Sanhedrin, 13:5), in which *minim* are associated with separatists and other types of “internal enemies.” Among these, פִּרְוָיָם (apostates), to whom Langer devotes a lengthy discussion (45–55), play a prominent role in these early rabbinic texts, just as they appear, in proximity to the *minim*, in the texts of BH from the early Islamic period.

\(^ {258} \) Ibid. p. 55 Langer notes, 82, p. 281 that the exceptions “are the better documented Version 1 from the Land of Israel which lacks this line entirely in all its exemplars, and Babylonian Version V, which includes segment but as the concluding element of the blessing.”
A parallel classical Greek usage of ‘son of’ as used in Josephus’ *Judean War* account occurs in the Homeric reference to the ‘sons of the Achaeans’ in the *Iliad* (1.162 – νίες Ἀχαϊών): thus indicating an urban or perhaps even sectarian cultural point of origin rather than a genealogical relationship which could also thus be quite plausible here as well. Josephus may here also have been critically alluding to an emphasis on ‘sons of Zadok’ in Judas’ doctrine although this is only made explicit in *Book 18*. Since Sepphoris was the capital of Galilee, it is quite understandable that Josephus might elsewhere refer to Judas as ‘the Galilean’. As well as this explanation of the phrase ‘son of’ being accepted for Judas here, the reference to a Judas, ‘son of Hezekias’ should also be considered to be describing Judas the Galilean as well.\(^{259}\) It is worth considering I believe that Josephus is again attempting to show the folly of the zealot emphasis on the heredity and lineage emphasis of the ‘sons of Zadok’ to an audience that may well already know a great deal about the full political and historical significance of their doctrines.

Meanwhile Josephus tells us that the arrested men associated with removing the eagle from the Temple were taken bound to Jericho, that Herod roused himself from his very serious illness to judge them with a meeting of magistrates in the Jericho amphitheatre. As can be seen from Josephus’ description in *Antiquities* (17.161-163) religion and politics were very intertwined with regards to this issue, especially given the likelihood of the eagle’s symbolic connection to Rome:

...and when they were come, he made them assemble in the theatre, and because he could not himself stand, he lay upon a couch, and enumerated the many labours that he had long endured on their account, and his building of the temple, and what a vast charge that was to him; while the Hasmonaeans, during the hundred and twenty-five years of their government, had not been able to perform any so great a work for the honour of God as that was: that he had also adorned it with very valuable donations: on which account he hoped that he had left himself a memorial, and procured himself a reputation after his death. He then cried out, that these men had not abstained from affronting him, even in his lifetime, but that, in the very daytime, and in the sight of the multitude, they had abused him to that degree, as to fall upon what he had dedicated, and in that way of abuse, had pulled it down to the ground.

---

They pretended, indeed, that they did it to affront him; but if anyone consider the thing truly, they will find that they were guilty of sacrilege against God therein. But the people, on account of Herod’s barbarous temper, and for fear he should be so cruel and to inflict punishment on them, said, what was done, was done without their approbation, and that it seemed to them that the actors might well be punished for what they had done. But as for Herod, he dealt more mildly with others of the assembly; but he deprived Matthias of the high priesthood, as in part an occasion of this action, and made Joazar, who was Matthias’ wife’s brother, high priest in his stead.

Here we also see a connection between the beginnings of these events and very likely the Zadokite high priesthood from Egypt at the time. Matthias had been high priest from 23 to 5 BCE. Josephus tells us the Matthias who had co-conspired with Judas was burned alive with others. What this co-conspiracy was based on theologically may be open to speculation but according to Josephus it was certainly related to the development of the Zealot movement. Josephus says that there was an eclipse of the moon the night this happened which can be dated to March 13, 4 BCE, Herod then died shortly after having his son Antipater killed.

It is worth noting at this point that the early church apologist and Roman lawyer, Tertullian, stated c. 208 CE concerning the birth of Jesus (Adversus Marcionem 4.19):

*It is known that a census was taken in Augustus’ reign in Judaea by Sentius Saturninus…*

This equates at a minimum with dates for Saturninus’ term of c. 7-6 BCE to c. 5 BCE as cited in H. St. J. Thackeray’s translation of Judean War (1.538, 577). As a practising Roman barrister Tertullian very likely had access to Roman historical sources we no longer possess. Could it be that the census begun under Saturnius began a revolt which continued until the arrival of Quirinius in 4 CE and that this is the underlying premise of both Luke and Josephus’ references to the census of Quirimius?

After discussing Herod’s funeral and Archelaus’ generous and compassionate behaviour in the face of widespread complaints about the enormous tax burdens of his father, Josephus tells us further that there were requests that the many people imprisoned by Herod be released. Meanwhile Archelaus awaited the decision of Augustus as to whether he would be allowed to reign as king after his father. Josephus tells us about the reaction of the pardoned

---

260 Cf. Tertullian’s reference to the fifteenth year of Severus emperor from 193-211 CE (Adversus Marcionem 1.15) Ernest Evans, Adversus Marcionem : At nunc quale est ut dominus anno xv Tiberii Caesaris revelatus sit, substantia vero anno xv iam Severi imperatoris nulla omnino comperta sit? anno xv M: a xii Redd. P. 38

261 Ibid p. 362. “Sed et census constat actos sub Augusto nunc in Iudaea per Sentium Saturninum”

persons involved in the Temple eagle removal after Herod’s death (Antiquities 17.206-218) graphically demonstrating the escalation of the social unrest:

At this time also it was, that some of the Jews got together, out of a desire of sedition. They lamented Matthias, and those who were slain with him by Herod, who had not any respect paid them by a funeral mourning, out of the fear men were in of that man; they were those who had been condemned for pulling down the golden eagle. The people made a great clamour and lamentation hereupon, and cast out some reproaches against the king also, as if that tended to alleviate the miseries of the deceased. The people assembled together, and desired of Archelaus that, in way of revenge on their account, he would inflict punishment on those who had been honoured by Herod; and that, in the first and principal place, he would deprive that high priest whom Herod had made, and would choose one more agreeable to the law, and of greater purity, to officiate as high priest. This was granted by Archelaus, although he was mightily offended at their importunity, because he proposed to himself to go to Rome immediately to look after Caesar’s determination about him. However, he sent the general of his forces to use persuasions, and to tell them that the death which was inflicted on their friends, was according to the law; and to represent to them, that their petitions about these things were carried to a great height of injury to him; that the time was not now proper for such petitions, but required their unanimity until such time as he should be established in the government by the consent of Caesar, and should then return to them; for that he would then consult with them in common concerning the purport of their petitions; but that they ought at present to be quiet, lest they should seem seditious persons. So when the king had suggested these things, and instructed his general in what he was to say, he sent him away to the people; but they made a clamour, and would not give him permission to speak, and put him in danger of his life, and as many more as were desirous to venture upon saying openly anything which might reduce them to a sober mind, and prevent their going on in their present courses, because they had more concern to have all their own wills performed than to yield obedience to their governors; thinking it to be a thing insufferable, that, while Herod was alive, they should lose those who were most dear to them, and that when he was dead, they could not get the actors to be punished. So they went on with their designs after a violent manner, and thought all to be lawful and right which tended to please them, and being unskilful in foreseeing what dangers they incurred; and when they had suspicion of such a thing, yet did the present pleasure they took in the punishment of those they deemed their enemies outweigh all such considerations; and although Archelaus sent many to speak to them, yet they treated them not as messengers sent by him, but as persons that came of their own accord to mitigate their anger, and would not let one of them speak. The sedition, also, was made by such as were in a great passion; and it was evident that they were proceeding further in seditious practices, by the multitude running so fast upon them. Now, upon the approach of that feast of unleavened bread, which the law of their fathers had appointed for the Jews at this time, which feast is called the Passover and is a memorial of their deliverance out of Egypt, (when they offer sacrifices with great alacrity; and when they are required to slay more sacrifices in number than at any other festival; and when an innumerable multitude came there out of the country, nay,
from beyond its limits also, in order to worship God,) the seditious lamented Judas and Matthias, those teachers of the law, and kept together in the temple, and had plenty of food, because these seditious persons were not ashamed to beg for it. And because Archelaus was afraid lest some terrible thing should spring up by means of these men's madness, he sent a regiment of armed men, and with them a captain of a thousand, to suppress the violent efforts of the seditious, before the whole multitude should be infected with the like madness; and gave them this charge, that if they found anyone much more openly seditious than others, and more busy in tumultuous practices, they should bring them to him. But those that were seditious on account of those teachers of the law, irritated the people by the noise and clamours they used to encourage the people in their designs; so they made an assault upon the soldiers, and came up to them, and stoned the greatest number of them, although some of them ran away wounded, and their captain among them; and when they had thus done, they returned to the sacrifices which were already in their hands. Now, Archelaus thought there was no way to preserve the entire government, but by cutting off those who made this attempt upon it; so he sent out the whole army upon them; and sent the horsemen to prevent those who had their tents outside of the temple, from assisting those who were within the temple, and to kill such as ran away from the footmen when they thought themselves out of danger; which horsemen slew three thousand men, while the rest went to the neighbouring mountains. Then did Archelaus order proclamation to be made to them all, that they should retire to their own homes; so they went away, and left the festival, out of fear of something worse which would follow, although they had been so bold by reason of their lack of instruction. So Archelaus went down to the sea with his mother, and took with him Nicolaus and Ptolemy, and many others of his friends, and left Philip, his brother, as governor of all things belonging both to his own family and to the public.

Archelaus then left for Rome to defend his place in his father’s will to Augustus against charges against him by his brother Antipas. According to Judean War (2.14) he went with “Poplas, Ptolemy, and Nicolas” but the majority of texts in Antiquities (17.219) give the list as “Nicolaus and Ptolemy, and many others” using Πτόλλαυς which is here translated as “many others”. However, according to two medieval texts of Antiquities, eleventh century Parisinus Gr. 1419 and Vaticanus Gr. Nr. 984 dated 1354 CE, the name Ptollas appears instead of Judean War’s Poplas (Πτόλλαυς instead of the other text tradition’s Πτόλλαυς): “Nicolaus and Ptolemy, and Ptollas”.

The late Magen Broshi published what he thought might be a link between the Dead Sea Scrolls of Qumran and this ‘Archelaus Massacre’ based on what is now referred to as fragment 4Q468e of the Dead Sea Scrolls. His arguments again touch on the difficulties of discerning the meaning of these ancient references.263

---

Broshi argued that the original reference in Josephus here had actually been Potlais. He states, citing *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* (p 342, n. 3) that the name was given to five Jews in Egypt and one in Cyrenaica, stating (p. 345):

...all the people attested as bearing this name are Jewish... Most probably this is a Hellenized form of the Hebrew name פוטיאל, *Putiel*.

The earliest reference to the name Putiel is found in Exodus 6:25 where it refers to the father-in-law of Eleazar, son of Aaron and father of the original biblical zealot Phineas’s mother. Linguistically it is believed to have been a hybrid of the Egyptian *pa-da* meaning “he who was given” and the Hebrew theophoric אלה, *El*. Hanan Eshel challenged Broshi’s suggestion that this Qumran reference to Potlais, was a reference to a friend of Archelaus named Potlais mentioned in *Antiquities* (17.219)

...there are four arguments which make it hard to accept this identification: (a) if indeed it were the same name, it should have been with a waw after the tav (Potlais and not Potlais); the Greek letter theta is usually transcribed as the Hebrew letter tet and not tav; (c) Archelaus’ friend is called Poplas in the *Jewish War* (2.14), as in most manuscripts of *Jewish Antiquities*; (d) Josephus does not mention that it was Archelaus’ friend who was responsible for the massacre at the Jerusalem Temple.264

As we have tried to argue, proper names in Josephus and elsewhere are by no means certain, especially obscure ones. Eshel cited Schwartz, Strugnell, as well as Horbury and Charlesworth to argue that the Potlais of 4Q468e should be identified with a Jewish officer mentioned by Josephus *Judean War* 1.162; *Antiquities* 14.84-85) named Peitholaus who joined Gabinius in 57 BCE in his war against Alexander, the son of Aristobulus II.265

---

265 D.R. Schwartz and J Strugnell op. Cit., W. Horbury, “The Proper Name in 4Q468g Peitholaus?”
Schwartz argued the Qumran text referred to events in 57 BCE. Horbury 56 BCE, while according to Eshel, the execution of Peitholaus in 53 BCE ‘should not be dismissed.’ All of which no doubt illustrates how problematic the issue of correctly interpreting these ancient texts and the names and dating associated with them can be. Nevertheless, Broshi’s statement concerning the date when the text was written is important to address:

The text is a palimpsest written over erased lines and there is no telling if the whole composition was written on recycled material or if only a few lines were substituted for an earlier text. It is written in a late first-century B.C.E. or early first-century C.E. mixed semi-cursive script. Some of the letters, such as aleph, samekh, sin and taw appear in their cursive and their book-hand forms.

The question must be asked as to what the significance was if this text was being copied during this time of tremendous societal upheaval in Judea: whether the change in “philosophies” to which Josephus refers in Antiquities 18.4ff. can be discerned in what was being written in Qumran during this time period. For example does the fact that previous text was erased indicate that writing materials were in short supply or was the actual content being revised here? If this text is too small and fragmentary to determine anything, what of other longer texts?

While Eshel argues at length that the original Dead Sea Scroll texts from Qumran date from the Hasmonean period and the still earlier Maccabean war, what is the meaning of their having been copied in the late first century BCE and early first century CE? Do they relate to the major social upheaval described in Josephus quoted above around the death of Herod and after? What is the ultimate meaning of all this prophetic interpretation and its relation to the so-called Teacher of Righteousness, the moreh hessedeq? Was there a connection to the Oniad Temple in Egypt for the phrase ‘the Egyptian prophet’? Is there a significance to this issue in the Hebrew article apparently added to Zadok in Pesher Habakkuk, making it hessedeq in the text of 1QpHab 2.2 already discussed and shown above?

Ilan devotes a whole section to what she calls ‘Ha Names’ – names with an article. For example the Jerusalem Talmud Yoma 6.3 43c has the nickname Ha-Afun meaning ‘the bean’ in Aramaic for the father of a priest in Sephoris. Ha-Galili meaning the ‘Galilean’ was found on an ossuary lid in Bethphage. Ilan lists nineteen predominantly father’s names in Hebrew from mostly pre-70 CE found in textual sources or ossuaries. She notes Zunz’s view that this was a Second Temple practice. It seems quite plausible that the Qumran usage of hessedeq

---


267 Ilan, Lexicon of Jewish Names op. cit. p. 445

was following this naming tradition as well.

Having survived the Great War with the Romans in 66-74 CE by surrendering to them, Josephus tells us at the beginning of his earliest Greek work, the Judean War that he knows his audience has already heard a great deal about the war and its causes (1.1b-2). He says that he is writing to set the record straight.

...while some men, who were not concerned in the affairs themselves, have gotten together vain and contradictory stories by hearsay, and have written them down after a sophisticated manner; and while those who were there present have given false accounts of things, and this either out of a humour of flattery to the Romans, or of hatred toward the Jews; and while their writings contain sometimes accusations, and sometimes encomiums, but nowhere the accurate truth of the facts,...

While Josephus’ initial statement in Judean War (1.33) about the Oniad temple in Egypt is admittedly brief, it seems more than likely that his audience already knows something about it and Onias. This contradicts the view of modern scholars who have argued that the Temple of Onias was obscure and unimportant. At the time of the Maccabean war, the Zadokite priest went to Egypt for asylum:

But Onias, the high priest, fled to Ptolemy, and received a place from him in the nome of Heliopolis, where he built a city resembling Jerusalem, and a temple that was like its temple; concerning which we shall speak more in its proper place hereafter.

Although Josephus ends (7.423-436) with a more lengthy discussion of this temple of Onias in Heliopolis, as stated earlier I believe that Josephus’ audience was much more aware of its significance than we moderns. Certainly on the Jewish side this would have been true as evidenced by the Mishnah (cf. Menehot (13:10) ) and Talmud (cf. Menehot 109ff. and at the end of tractate Zevahim). The association of onos (oνος), meaning “ass” with Onias (Ονίας)

---

269 Here Judean War (1.1-2): οι μεν ου’ παρατυχόντες τοις πράγμασιν ἄλλ’ ἀκοη’ συλλέγοντες εικ αια καὶ ἀσύμφωνα διηγήματα σοφιστικός διαγράφοντοι οἱ παραγενόμενοι δὲ ἡ κολακεία τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίοις ὡς ἡ μίση τῷ πρὸς Ἰουδαίως καταφεύγοντα τῶν πραγμάτων περιεχὲι δὲ αὐτῷ οὗτός οὐ μὴν κατηγορίαν ὅπου δὲ ἐγκώμιον τὰ συγγράμματα τῷ σῆματες τῆς ἱστορίας αὐξάμοι

270 The way that Josephus first speaks of Onias just before this (1.31-32), on a par with Antiochus Epiphanies and the Tobiads also seems to indicate an audience already familiar with these people, thus: At the same time that Antiochus, who was called Epiphanes, had a quarrel with the sixth Ptolemy about his right to the whole country of Syria, a great sedition happened among the men of power in Judea, and they had a contention about obtaining the government; while each of those who were of dignity could not endure to be subject to their equals. However, Onias, one of the high priests, got the better, and cast the sons of Tobias out of the city; who fled to Antiochus, and besought him to make use of them for his leaders, and to make an expedition into Judea. The king being thereto disposed beforehand, complied with them, and came upon the Jews with a large army, and took their city by force, and slew a great multitude of those who favoured Ptolemy, and sent out his soldiers to plunder them, without mercy. He also spoiled the temple, and put a stop to the constant practice of offering a daily sacrifice of expiation, for three years and six months.
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could well play into this Roman awareness.

As Schwartz says of the necessity that post-World War II twentieth century Christian scholarship see the true role of the Zealots in ancient Judea:

It is, therefore, not surprising that Christian scholarship might begin to do what nationalist Jewish scholarship had been doing for several decades: rehabilitating the Zealots by showing that Josephus' condemnation of them, far from being the whole truth and nothing but the truth, was in fact an invective resulting from the needs of Josephus' apologetics on behalf of himself and of his nation. On the personal level, Josephus, who had himself been a rebel general, had to convince the Romans that he had truly learned his lesson; this required thorough condemnation of other rebels. And on the national level, which is too often forgotten in this context, Josephus was concerned that the Romans believe that those who led a Jewish revolt against Rome were not acting out of any legitimate Jewish motives. For if they were, Rome would have to conclude that Judaism must inevitably clash with Rome, and, therefore, is not to be tolerated.

Thus, to conclude this second consideration, we reiterate that the appearance of the Jewish state, in a war won against great odds, encouraged scholars to re-study the Zealot analogue, and the result of such scholarship was their rehabilitation as legitimate successors of the Maccabees...

I believe that a possible Judean zealot connection, theological and otherwise, with the Zadokite community in Egypt has thus also been sadly neglected.

It is true that Robert Hayward (1982) has stated of the Jewish connection to Leontopolis in Egypt,

One of the most intriguing episodes in the history of the age of the Second Temple is the foundation at Leontopolis of a Jewish temple served by legitimate priests and Levites. It was built sometime in the second century B.C., and was closed by order of Rome in 74 A.D. In recent years, scholars have once again drawn attention to its importance.

---

272 Ibid. n. 4. According to Schwartz, this could be done with more or less sympathy for Josephus: “See, for example, the sympathetic evaluation offered by J. N. Simchoni in the introduction to his Hebrew translation of BJ (1923), esp. pp. 11-23, on the one hand, and the condemning contrast of Josephus to the Zealots offered by A. Schalit in Mosnaim 2 (1933/34), pp. 296—305 Hebrew). ... In general, on the widespread condemnation of Josephus in the "classical conception" of him, which made this particular aspect all the easier. see P. Bilde, Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, his Works, and their Importance (1988), pp. 126-128.”
Hayward might have been accurate to have said “once legitimate priest” as according to the Mishnah and Talmud they were no longer to be considered legitimate. Yet it is seldom even commented upon that in his earliest work, the *Judean War*, Josephus both starts and ends his account of the conflict with a reference to the Zadokite temple in Egypt and its subsequent closure after the destruction of Jerusalem and Masada. Why did the Romans do this?

It is true that Hayward noted J.A. Goldstein’s argument that the Egyptian temple’s founder wrote propagandist literature in support of his scheme, including the stories of the Tobiads, which we find now in Josephus’ *Antiquities*. J.J. Collins, in his *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism*, argued that Leontopolis influenced the author of *Sibylline Oracles* book 3. Although mainstream scholarly opinion has hardly considered either the possibility of a link between the literature discovered at Qumran and this temple in Egypt or that both may have played an instrumental role in the ideologies of those participating in the Judean war, it is time that this be examined more deeply. In fact Hayward did examine some possible connections between Leontopolis and the Qumran literature. He considered such matters as the temple tower and its height, the altar and offerings, the candlestick, the Isaiah proof-texts, the wall, and the New Jerusalem ideology. However there has scarcely been a response in wider Qumran or Jewish scholarship.

Important further exceptions include Joan E. Taylor (1998) who stated at the conclusion of her “A Second Temple in Egypt: The Evidence for the Zadokite Temple of Onias”:

Furthermore, the connection between the “Zadokites” of the documents in the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus and the Zadokites of the Egyptian temple built by Onias III should surely be investigated further. If the group which lived in Qumran and other sites southwards along the Dead Sea were led by Zadokites, then what were their connections with the Zadokite group in Egypt? The origins of the groups evidenced in the Scrolls may yet be more complex than hitherto supposed. Finally, it may perhaps be worth remembering that the *Damascus Document* was originally found down the road from Heliopolis, in Cairo. An Egyptian link has been there all along.

There has also been an attempt to link the Teacher of Righteousness from Qumran with the Oniads of Leontopolis by Paul A. Rainbow in his (1997), “The Last Oniad and the Teacher of Righteousness”. It appears that there is archaeological evidence as well.

---

277 Paul A. Rainbow, “The Last Oniad and the Teacher of Righteousness” *Journal of Jewish Studies*
As discussed above, two Finnish archaeologists, Minna and Kenneth Lönnqvist discuss the Tomb of Zadok according to the Copper Scroll (3Q15) as well as a possible connection with the Tomb of Jason, the proto-history of the Qumran community in connection with Egypt, the Temple of Onias, the solar calendar and many other matters after spending five years doing archaeological research at the Ecole Biblique in Jerusalem and environs in their *Archaeology of the Hidden Qumran - The New Paradigm* (2002). 278 Since Roland de Vaux’s excavations at Qumran in the 1950s were never formally published and the Lönnqvists spent five years studying the artifacts from his excavations their analysis is worth considering. They are convinced that there is important evidence which shows a connection between the Oniads in Egypt and the archaeological site of Qumran. Although further archaeological evidence from the Ecole Biblique has now also been published by J.-B. Humbert and A. Chambon in the form of photographs and Roland de Vaux’s excavation notes, 279 there is still no universally accepted synthesis of the original evidence both archaeological and textual. On the contrary, important areas of interpretation are still hotly contested and consensus still seems highly elusive. 280 I believe there may corroborating evidence to my above proposed connection with Josephus in the coinage discovered at Qumran.

Kenneth K.A. Lönnqvist’s recently published doctoral thesis, *New Perspectives on the Roman Coinage on the Eastern Limes in the Late Republican and Roman Imperial Period*, provides the first comprehensive publications of the coins discovered at Qumran. 281 His chapter, “The Numismatic Chronology of Qumran: Fact and Fiction,” His consideration of a total of 1250 coins found at Qumran shows three peaks:

---


278 Minna and Kenneth Lönnqvist, *Archaeology of the Hidden Qumran - The New Paradigm* (Helsinki University Press, 2002). Although my convictions about a possible connection between Qumran and Egypt were already strong when I met the Lönnqvists at 4ICAANE in Berlin in 2004 I have been very grateful for their professional scholarship and insights which have developed since our initial discussions.


While works such as the important overview by Devorah Dimant, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective: A History of Research* are significant in helping to move towards such a synthesis, it is significant that the work of the Lönnqvists is not mentioned in this overview - while some may have felt their assessment of a lack of adequate archaeological assessment was misguided their years of study with the artefacts is important to consider.

The largest comprises the 145 coins of Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 BC). Altogether, the Hasmonean period yielded 171 coins for 98 years of rule. The Herodian dynasty yielded together 118 coins although there is a difference in pattern between the early and late Herodian coinage, to which we shall return. The Procuratorial coinage in the centre forms the second peak with a total of 104 coins minted during 60 years, especially under P. Pilate (AD 26-36) and P. Festus (AD 59). The third and last peak represents the coinage of Herod Agrippa I/II and of the first Jewish Revolt (AD 66-70).  

The Lönnqvists were very critical of Magness and Hirschfeld’s analyses of the Hasmonean and Herodian coinage at Qumran. They stated:

Magness (p. 67) thus clearly downdated the circulation of the coinage of Alexander Jannaeus by at least a half century into the reign of Herod, who, she claims, minted relatively few coins. Similarly, Hirschfeld (p. 54): “We must abandon two more of de Vaux’s assumptions. The first of these is the idea of a thirty-year gap in settlement at Qumran. On the basis of the numismatic finds at Qumran, several scholars have already shown that the gap did not exceed a few years or did not exist at all’. These claims are unsubstantiated. Magness and Hirschfeld do not warn readers that their numismatic conclusions are their own and do not represent the mainstream numismatic research; their numismatic discussion is marred by highly speculative interpretations presented as facts.  

282 Ibid. p. 89, chapter 5 is co-authored by Minna Lönnqvist.  
The Lönnqvists note that Herod is known to have minted at least 24 main bronze coin types in the period between 37-4 BCE. They cite statistics from Meshorer’s *Ancient Jewish Coinage* to state that although some Herodian coins are rare but others are known to have been minted in large quantities. They question the ability to date archaeological contexts of coins from the reign of Jannaeus which Magness dates to the Herodian period, as well as her assumptions about what the coins found at Qumran actually demonstrate:

It seems that Herod started minting his three dated series of large bronze coins in c. 40-37 BC to compete with and finally oust the coins of the last Hasmonean kings still in circulation, while at the same time fighting against the Hasmonean’s strong social and economic influence. ...Another inconsistent chronological argument used by Magness is that the Herodian coin total from Qumran shows that the site’s occupation was uninterrupted throughout Herod’s rule 37-4 BC, since some coins were found at the site. Yet she uses the ‘small’ number of 2nd century BC coins (in fact about 50% more than the coins of Herod the Great) as evidence that occupation did not start then.

The Lönnqvists cite their earlier work to state,

The environmental evidence...shows that Qumran was inhabited at least c. 37-33 BC, but the geo-archaeological evidence does not allow the lower date to be fixed. It does, however, point to a long gap in occupation, and this explains the abnormal Herodian coin profile. The Nabatean coins may indicate when Qumran was in use again; those which we have identified were minted about the time when Herod the Great dies or a few years later (5BC - AD 3), which agrees quite well also with the burial date of the Qumran silver hoards”...

Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls have been the source of passionate ideas and theories as well as angry charges and even legal action.

More than thirty years ago Barbara E. Thiering’s *Redating the Teacher of Righteousness* was published and is but one then influential example of challenges to earlier attempts to associate the Dead Sea Scrolls with an Essene community still believed by some to have been located at Khirbet Qumran. There remain many passionate scholarly defenders on both sides of this

---


285 Ibid. p 97.

286 Ibid. p. 98 (p. 135 in *The Numismatic Chronicle*).


debate. Thiering began her critique of what has come to be termed the ‘Standard Model’ for Qumran studies by pointing out that there is no mention of the Teacher of Righteousness (moreh hassedeq - a term I believe could more accurately be translated, at least in many Qumran texts as ‘Teacher of Zadok’) in the first century CE Jewish historian Josephus. As indicated elsewhere, I believe that she was wrong about this. However she argued:

The procedure of the present study is to give rather more value to the textual evidence than has yet been done. The text will be assumed to be consistent, until proved inconsistent, rather than the reverse. There is already apparent a habit of consistency that has not been given sufficient weight. Once the pesharists have made their (to us) arbitrary assumption that all the prophecies of scripture refer to their own times, and given particular applications to the scriptural terms, they never change them. The “righteous” of the scripture is always interpreted of the Teacher of Righteousness, and the named enemies of the OT are always the Kittim.289

This kind of thinking seems now dated after the work of Gabriele Boccaccini and others to demonstrate the complexity of Dead Sea Scrolls theologies. Much more of the Qumran corpus has been published since Thiering’s work was written - showing more chronological complexity as well. An example of the growth in additional texts studied is Michael Owen Wise whose original University of Chicago doctoral thesis suggested 145 BCE as the date for the composition of the Temple Scroll (1990) but who concluded in his “Dating the Teacher of Righteousness and the Floruit of his Movement” (2003):

The proposal to locate the Teacher and the rise of his movement in the first century B.C.E. has much in its favor. The idea explains the totality of the evidence at least as well as does the consensus worked out in the 1950s. Given the nature of that evidence, this is not an issue on which certainty will ever be possible. Nevertheless, the historian’s goal is still the best possible synthesis. The first-century option deserves consideration as precisely that.290

289 Ibid. pp. 5-6, Magness, p. 68.

February 20, 2007, Wise’s former professor at the University of Chicago, Norman Golb posted an even more critical article on the U. Chicago website entitled “The Qumran- Essene Theory and recent Strategies in its Defense” which concludes (p.13): “Whether the American public will continue to accept the increasingly dubious treatment of the Scrolls in ostensibly scientific writings and in museum exhibits without pressing for fundamental change cannot be foretold. Now, however, is surely the time to consider whether these efforts, so contrary to the spirit of fair play and openness that are the very trademarks of a healthy society, in any way result from the exercise of financial influence either here or abroad. There are those who know the answer to this question; should they not finally give the public a truthful account instead of hiding behind a Qumran-like wall of silence? All the more remarkable is the resounding silence of traditional Qumranologists in the face of these recent efforts. Why have they failed to express a single objection to the one-sided exhibitions, the slanted rosters of speakers, and the censored lists of recommended readings? As in the case of many other discoveries of modern times, serious debate now prevails regarding the question of origin and identification of the Dead Sea Scrolls. By long-established
This view, if correct, would certainly move us away from the possibility of linking the *Teacher of Righteousness* to the second century BCE Oniads. However, I believe that there are aspects of the evidence that must be re-examined further in the light of our current knowledge. Josephus speaks eloquently at the beginning of his *Antiquities* Book 18 of a shift in interpretation that occurred at the time of Judas the Galilean. I believe that Thiering and Wise are at least partially discerning the evidence of this shift. However I believe this shift developed from an earlier Qumran proto-history which had a strong connection with the Oniads in Egypt and this connection was not absent in the first century BCE and CE.

There is no question that the violence in Judea continued. We are told by Josephus that Varus, the governor of Syria, sent a letter to Rome stating that in Archelaus’ absence, the whole nation had become unruly and that there was a revolt of the Jews which Varus had been unable to put down (*Antiquities* 17.250-255):

...letters came from Varus, the governor of Syria, which informed Caesar of the revolt of the Jews; for after Archelaus had sailed, the whole nation was in a tumult. So Varus, since he was there himself, brought the authors of the disturbance to punishment; and when he had restrained them for the most part from this sedition, which was a great one, he took his journey to Antioch, leaving one legion of his army at Jerusalem to keep the Jews quiet, who were now very fond of sedition. Yet did not this at all avail to put an end to their sedition; for, after Varus was gone away, Sabinus, Caesar’s procurator, stayed behind, and greatly distressed the Jews, relying on the forces that were left there that they would by their numbers protect him; for he made use of them, and armed them as his guards, thereby so oppressing the Jews, and giving them so great disturbance, that at length they rebelled; for he used force in seizing the citadels, and zealously pressed on the search after the king’s money, in order to seize upon it by force, on account of his love of gain and his extraordinary covetousness. But on the approach of Pentecost, which is a festival of ours, so called from the days of our forefathers, a great many ten thousands of men got together; nor did they come only to celebrate the festival, but out of their indignation at the madness of Sabinus, and at the injuries he gave them. A great number there was of Galileans, and Idumeans, and many men from Jericho, and others who had passed over the river Jordan, and inhabited those parts. This whole multitude joined themselves to all the rest, and were more zealous than the others in making an assault on Sabinus, in order to be avenged on him; so they divided themselves into three bands, and encamped themselves in the places following:—some of them seized the hippodrome; and of the other two bands, one pitched themselves from the northern part of the temple to the southern, on the east quarter; but the third band held the western part of the city, where the king’s palace was. Their work tended entirely to besiege the Romans, and to enclosure them on all sides. Now Sabinus was afraid of the number of men, and of their resolution, who had little regard to their lives, but were very desirous not to be overcome.

ustom in the world of learning, the manifest obligation of scholars is not to condone the stifling of that debate, but to encourage it in consonance with traditional scientific criteria of candor and transparency. As always in the past, censorship only exposes a weakness in the system that imposes it.”
while they thought it a sign of power to overcome their enemies; so he sent immediately a letter to Varus, and, as he used to do, was very pressing with him, and entreated him to come quickly to his assistance; because the forces he had left were in imminent danger, and would probably, in no long time, be seized upon, and cut to pieces;

After describing the battle in detail, including how Sabinus seized at least 400 talents of sacred money from the Temple and the Jewish siege of the palace after considerable of their numbers had already been killed, Josephus continues (17.269):

*Now, at this time there were ten thousand other disorders in Judea, which were like tumults, because a great number put themselves into a warlike posture, either out of hopes of gain to themselves, or out of enmity to the Jews.*

At the beginning of Book 13 of *Antiquities*, Josephus makes the following statement (13:1) concerning another Judas who had figured prominently in the previous Book:

*By what means the nation of the Jews recovered their freedom when they had been brought into slavery by the Macedonians, and what struggles, and how many great battles Judas, the general of their army, ran through, till he was slain as he was fighting for them, has been related in the foregoing book:*

Here of course Josephus is speaking of Judas Maccabeus but I believe Josephus began *Antiquities* Book 18 with a similar stylistic feature when he speaks of another Judas (18.4) already discussed above:

... *yet was there one Judas, a Gaulonite, of a city whose name was Gamala, who, taking with him Zadok [Sadduc], a Pharisee, became zealous to draw them to a revolt, who both said that this taxation was no better than an introduction to slavery, and exhorted the nation to assert their liberty: ...*

While it may well be that many parents named their children Judas in this time period, James S. McLaren, in his 2001 SBL paper, “Would the Real Judas Please Stand Up?” notes that in Josephus

... *War* 2.117 it is claimed that Judas was from Galilee. In *Ant*. 18.4 Judas is identified as ‘a Gaulanite, from a city named Gamala’.

McLaren argues that they are both the same person. I believe that it must also be asked whether Judas ‘the son of Hezekiah’ (*Antiquities* 17.271) and Judas, ‘of Sariphaeus’ (in *Antiquities* 17.149ff.) or ‘son of Sepphoris’ (in *Judean War* 1.648) were also the same person as Judas the Galilean. Clarification of these identities has certainly long been argued in Josephus scholarship. After discussing an uprising by Herod’s old soldiers, we thus read (17.271) of a connection between Judas son of Ezekias and Sepphoris in Galilee:
There was also Judas, the son of that Ezekias who had been head of the robbers; which Ezekias was a very strong man, and had with great difficulty been caught by Herod. This Judas, having gotten together a multitude of men of a profligate character around Sepphoris in Galilee, made an assault upon the palace there, and seized upon all the weapons that were laid up in it, and with them armed everyone of those who were with him, and carried away what money was left there;291

Given the difficulties of deciphering cursive Greek when *Antiquities* was copied in antiquity and the Middle Ages as already discussed, there are other possible sources of error here as well. It can thus reasonably be asked whether Zadok the Pharisee was actually a contemporary of Judas or was Josephus actually referring to Judas as a ‘Zadok Pharisee’ who helped found a violent fourth philosophy or theology and a separatist (a meaning of Pharisee) ‘sons of Zadok’ theology now so familiar from the Dead Sea Scrolls literature. If so, then the question of Judas’ ancestry further becomes an important polemical tool for Josephus as he critiqued and thus even ridiculed the Zadokite emphasis on their exclusive high priestly lineage and heredity apparently going back to Zadok the priest at the time of King David and perhaps Melchizedek at the time of Abraham.

It is important to note at this point where many have thought that this ‘fourth philosophy’ described by Josephus were the zealots, and although Josephus does not say this explicitly in this passage, nor does he explicitly mention the sicarii here, Josephus does say (18.10):

*because the infection which spread there among the younger sort, who were zealous for it, brought the public to destruction*

Here at the beginning of *Antiquities* Book 18, Josephus uses only Greek synonyms for ζηλωτής. While it is true that the actual Greek verb (ζηλώω) does not appear in Book 18 of *Antiquities* until line 200, (where it is used in the prophetic speech of the German prisoner bound with Agrippa), it is used very significantly of Judas ‘the son of Ezekias’ in the very next verse to that quoted above (17.271) which is in the immediately following section after mentioning that there were 10,000 other disorders. Josephus says this Judas had organized an insurrection in Sepphoris, Galilee and then continues (17.272):

*and he [Judas] became terrible to all men, by tearing and rending those who came near him; and all this in order to raise himself, and out of an ambitious desire (ζηλώσει) of the royal dignity; and he hoped to obtain that as the reward not of his virtuous skill in war, but of his extravagance in doing injuries.*

---

291 Ἰωάννας δὲ ἦν Ἐξεχίου τοῦ ἀρχιληπτοῦ, ὡς ἐπὶ μέγα δυσηθέντος ὑπὲρ Ἡρώδου δὲ μεγάλους λεηφθέντας πάνως ὁδοὺς ὅπου ὁ Ἰωάννας περὶ Σέφφοριν τῆς Γαλιλαίας συστηματίσατο πλῆθος ἀνδρῶν ἀποεὐθεμένων ἑπάρχοντι τῷ βασιλέᾳ ποιεῖται, καὶ ὅπως κρατήσας ὅποσα αὐτῷ ἀπέκειτο ὡπλίζει τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν καὶ ἀποφέρεται χρήματα ὅποσα κατελήφθη αὐτῷ.
Many scholars have in fact associated this Judas with Judas the Galilean. Although Judas was a common name and it is difficult for us to be certain which of the several men named Judas associated with Sepphoris the capital of Galilee here were which (Judas the Galilean, Judas son of Sepphoris, Judas son of Ezekias who sacked the palace in Sepphoris and Judas of Gamala) or, as I believe, they may all have been the same person, it seems very important to consider that Josephus may well have also been critiquing the possibly already infamous Zadokite doctrine emphasizing their sacred theological genealogy as the ‘sons of Zadok’. In their minds they saw themselves as the only true high priests of God. It is important to consider this as the underlying theology of at least some of this revolt which ultimately destroyed the temple and Judea. Our modern confusion about this is perhaps easy to understand, especially given the theological agendas of the various surviving groups post 70 CE. Perhaps this may also be because we have had trouble associating theology with violence and especially with seeing religious violence in association with our religious roots. However if such considerations are examined more critically, it is possible to see how someone named Judas who came from Gamal by way of Sepphoris in Galilee, and who had captured a palace full of arms there could have come to be called Judas of Sepphoris or the Galilean and could possibly also have taught students zealous theology in Jerusalem. Thus such a theologically driven tax revolt can be seen as the possible backdrop of Jesus’ birth and a strong developmental influence on Jesus’ kingdom of God theology which included salvation for all - not just the theologically ‘pure’ of the Qumran covenanters. By examining a theology of violence in the milieu of the origins of modern Jewish and Christian faith, it may help us to better appreciate our best approach to religious terrorism in more modern times.\[^{292}\]

The Reverend Jim Collins  
Holy Trinity Anglican Church  
Danford Lake, Quebec  J0X 1P0  CANADA  January 2, 2016

\[^{292}\] To understand Josephus and Luke’s Gospel reference to the ‘census of Quirinius’ it might be helpful to consider an American Revolution parallel to this Galilean tax revolt at the end of Herod’s reign as Washington’s Tea Party. The city of Washington did not yet exist at the time of the Boston Tea Party, and George Washington was born at Bridges Creek in Virginia but he became the first president of the newly formed United States and the new centre of government after 1800 became known as Washington. From the British point of view Washington was a revolutionary after he became commander of the revolutionary forces but he was also definitely involved in developing a new philosophy of government and nationhood, becoming the first American president. There was also a nationalist theological agenda in terms of separating from the authority of King George over the Church of England for many who revolted. However where George Washington was successful in his revolt against the British, Judas was not successful against the Romans. After 70 CE Josephus was left trying to defend his country and his faith to the Romans after a disastrous and very tragic war. The ‘census of Quirinius’ can thus be seen as having been named after Quirinius who finally quelled a tax revolt that began shortly before the death of King Herod and lasted over 10 years.
Coin with portrait of Antiochus IV. Reverse shows Apollo seated on an omphalos. The Greek inscription reads ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΕΠΙΦΑΝΟΥΣ ΝΙΚΗΦΟΡΟΥ (King Antiochus, the divine Epiphanus, Bringer of Victory.)
Appendix 1

Examples of Challenges Facing Late Classical and Medieval Scribes Copying First Century Texts

Papyrus 3781 - Announcement of the Accession of Hadrian, 25 August 117 CE

This circular letter to Rammius Martialis (abbreviated PAMM MAPT), perfect of Egypt, officially informed a number of district governors of the accession of the emperor Hadrian, instructing them to declare festivities in their area. The date tells us that Hadrian was proclaimed emperor in Antioch without senate approval and this memo was sent without confirmation from Rome. All the Egyptian districts cited here are also abbreviated: Letopolite (ΛΗΤΟ), Memphite (ΜΕΜΦΕΙ), Arsinoite (ΑΡΣΙ), etc. Very likely Zadok was similarly difficult to discern.

This and the following reproduction are taken from J.R. Rea, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* Vol. LV (London: The Egyptian Exploration Society for the British Academy).

Shown on the next page:

Papyrus 3777 - Sworn Cession of Catoecic Land 2-31 August 57 BCE

This text shows that by some date in the period 2-31 August 57 BCE Bernice IV was reigning alone after the death of her colleague Cleopatra Tryphaena. Although Alexandria is written in full in this earlier text, Phainippus and Peeno are not.
From Sir Edward Maunde Thompson - *Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography*

From this chart it can be seen that even in the literary alphabet the Josephus’ *Judean War* is held to have been written, a sloppy first century epsilon (Ε) could be mistaken for a gamma (Γ) etc. Thus MAPEA or MAPIOYΘ could have been misinterpreted and written later as ΜΑΡΓΑΛΟΥ/ΜΑΡΓΑΛΩΘΟΥ or written as Megloithi in Latin. For this see importantly, Michael E. Hardwick, *Josephus as an Historical Source in Patristic Literature through Eusebius* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989). In his analysis of Theophilus of Antioch and his reliance on Josephus’ *Against Apion* for the pharaoh lists from Mantheo, Hardwick states, “Since Theophilus could follow Josephus closely and accurately, it seems likely that the discrepancies are the result of scribal error during the transmission of the text rather than an error during composition.”
From Sir Edward Maunde Thompson - *Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography*

Josephus' *Antiquities* is believed to have been circulated in cursive script which could have even more easily been miscopied. With the internet age we are now leaving a tradition where the accuracy of a text was standardized and great emphasis was placed on adherence to a standard - unlike examples we have from the first century.
The following images of Pesher Habakkuk *1QpHab* 1.13; V.10; VII.4; VIII.3; IX.9 and XI.5 (as displayed here, from Brill, Leiden/Boston 2006) from Qumran. This scroll has been dated to the second half of the first century BCE.
1QpHab II.2

1QpHab V.10

1QpHab VII.4
1QpHab VIII.3

1QpHab IX.9-15

1QpHab XI.11.5
4Q163-pIsa c Frg
The Falls of Daphne outside of Antioch in Modern Times (photo by Jim Collins 1999)
Map from Charles R. Morey, "The Excavation of Antioch-on-the-Orontes"

**Fig. 1.** Restored plan of the principal arteries of the ancient city.
Plan 2. — Plan d’Antioche avec les surfaces couvertes par les différents clichés.
Fig 11. — Vue aérienne de l'ancienne île de l'Oronte avec le temple et un hippodrome (vol 2).


Le podium du temple (3) mesure environ 107m de long sur 72m de large, ce qui conduit à un rapport de 3/2. Or, nous constatons que la distance entre le grand axe (A) et le bord ouest du podium mesure deux fois la largeur du podium. Les écarts des limites que nous avons présentés ci-dessus (sens est-ouest) sont des multiples d'une demi largeur du podium, soit d'environ 36m. Ce module peut s'interpréter soit en utilisant l'actus de 35,5m (= 120 pieds romains) soit en utilisant le pied hellénistique des seleucides (= 35,2m). Cela nous conduit à des îlots qui mesuraient 107 x 36m, soit un rapport de 3/1; le temple occuperait l'espace de deux îlots.
Ce petit maillage semblerait plutôt d'époque hellénistique, car on sait que l'hippodrome fut implanté en 67 av. J.-C., par le proconsul de Cilicie, Q. Marcius Rex, donc à la veille de l'occupation romaine, ce que semble d'ailleurs confirmer les fouilles américaines.

---

Previous page is the Hellenistic Antioch temple ruins Imagery DigitalGlobe, Map data Basarsoft. Google accessed April 10, 2015:
https://www.google.ca/maps/@36.2257511,36.1745505,350m/data=!3m1!1e3

Delphi Greece Apollo Temple - CNES / Astrium, Map data Google accessed April 10, 2015:
https://www.google.ca/maps/place/Delphi/@38.4820581,22.5012653,228m/data=!3m1!1e3!4m2!3m1!1s0x135f795df629b6f1:0xca3bd4a9b97e9054
Aerial view of Ephesus Temple of Artemis Ruins Imagery CNES/Astrium, Map data Basarsoft, Google accessed April 10, 2015:
https://www.google.ca/maps/search/ephesus/@37.9506888,27.3656511,371m/data=!3m1!1e3
SELEUCID KINGDOM. Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-164 BC). Æ 17mm (5.26 gm). Akko-Ptolemais(?). Radiate head of Antiochus right / Nike driving biga left. SC 1484. HGC 9, 669. Scarce issue for the Seleucid campaign in Egypt:
Mummy portrait of a young woman with a double pearl necklace ca. 150 CE from Fayum, Egypt - Encaustic on wood. Antikensaamlung, Staatliche Museen, Berlin, Germany, Art Resource, N.Y. Photograph, Ingrid Geske-Heiden
FIGURE 4: The basilica building at Sepphoris, erected while Jesus was growing up in nearby Nazareth. Drawing by James F. Strange.