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ABSTRACT
It is argued that the Dead Sea Scrolls are not only of significance for contemporary biblical studies in the fields of textual criticism and the religio-historical background of the Jewish people shortly before the emergence of Christianity, but that it also challenges biblical studies in terms of fundamental issues of principle relating to the literary character of the writings in question. Since this concerns primarily the Scriptures important to the Qumran community, to other currents within the ancient Jewish and Christian folds and to present-day scholarly work, the significance of the Dead Sea Scrolls is first and foremost a question of the relationship of that which was done in Qumran with the literature later called the Hebrew Bible or the Christian Old Testament, to that which we are doing with this legacy in the disciplines of Judaic Studies and Old Testament scholarship. The thesis is set up that the significance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for our dealing with the Hebrew Bible is not merely a matter of the import of certain texts for certain other texts, nor simply a technical matter of (re)constructing a 'reliable' text form of the Bible, but also at a deeper level a matter of reflecting in principle on very fundamental issues of interpretation made necessary by the intrinsic character of these scrolls. The aspects of text variants as invitations to dialogue and of the Scrolls as intertext, are addressed and illustrated with representative examples.

A INTRODUCTION

Since subtitles are normally more important that main titles, I begin with a reflection on the subtitle for this essay. As it stands, it supposes that the Dead Sea Scrolls have relevance for reading the Old Testament. In the light of the research undertaken in the last half a century it is of course clear that many scholars are of this opinion. But in a scholarly context the formulation is rather

---

1 I use this term alongside ‘Hebrew Bible’, since more than the Hebrew Bible is at stake when we speak of ‘the Dead Sea Scrolls; cf. Brooke & Lindars 1992. Moreover, Professor J H le Roux, to whom this essay is dedicated in gratitude, is professor of not only Hebrew Bible, but also and primarily of Old Testament.

to be interpreted as a question, for propositions in an academic environment always remain hypotheses – also when they are cast as statements, and perhaps especially when they are regarded as proven and by general consensus enjoy broad acceptance. Since hypotheses essentially are results to be queried further, I shall now query the supposition of my subtitle – of course, with its effects on the ‘main’ title. So, the question is whether the Dead Sea Scrolls do in fact have significance for the Hebrew Bible.

In my opinion the answer is simply ‘no’. The Dead Sea Scrolls have no significance for this Bible. But they do have great significance for that which we can do with this Bible as well as for that which we can do with other Bibles. Of course it would be possible to counter that exactly that is meant in the first place by the wording of the given question. But I intentionally begin with this observation, since, phrased as it is, it exemplifies the orientation of what I wish to offer in this paper.

Of course the Dead Sea Scrolls have a lot to do with the Hebrew Bible, since many manuscripts and manuscript fragments of Bible books have been found in the caves there, while many others relate closely and intensively to the Hebrew Bible. Moreover, their chronological placing in the period immediately before the emergence of Christianity makes them highly relevant for working with the Hebrew Bible, because precisely the time between the two destructions of Jerusalem was vital for the origin of this Bible. A further aspect already implicitly suggesting such meaning is the selection of biblical books attested to by the Dead Sea Scrolls, since this demonstrates the relevance of these texts for our consideration of the canon of the Hebrew Bible as well as the canons of other Bibles in the Jewish and Christian traditions. My following reflections therefore have their point of departure in the history of research, notably that scholarly work on the Dead Sea Scrolls by its intrinsic evidence has significance. Accordingly the topic may be formulated as

the question as to the relationship of that which was done in Qumran with the literature later called the Hebrew Bible or the Christian Old Testament, to that which we are doing with this legacy in the disciplines of Judaic Studies and Old Testament scholarship.

For the purposes of this article I accordingly submit the thesis that

the significance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for our dealing with the Hebrew Bible is not merely a matter of the import of certain texts for certain other texts, nor simply a technical matter of (re)constructing a ‘reliable’ text form of the Bible, but also a matter of the reflection in principle on very fundamental issues of interpretation made necessary by the intrinsic character of these scrolls.

We begin with aspects of this significance that are usually presupposed, suggested or mentioned in mainstream work in the field of Qumran studies. At this
point the usual indemnificatory reference has its place, notably that there can be no question of completeness or detail in the treatment of such a wide topic within the constraints of an article. My purpose is, rather, to programmatically point out a number of dimensions by briefly illustrating them.

B ASPECTS OF THE SIGNIFICANCE

1 Text variants as invitations

To anyone concerned with the Hebrew text of the Old Testament it goes without saying that the significance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for textual criticism has been immense over the last half a century. Whereas its religio-historical relevance has been paramount for the study of the New Testament and early Christianity, its value for the study of the text of the Hebrew Bible lies in the field of textual criticism. But what is this ‘textual criticism’ actually? I shall argue somewhat further on that the relationship between the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Old Testament is an intertextual one. If that proves to hold water, it would suggest that the text-critical relevance of Qumran for the study of the Hebrew Bible points to intertextuality. If the Scrolls’ relationship to the Hebrew Bible is an intertextual one, then that aspect of the relationship called ‘textual criticism’ should also be seen as an intertextual relationship.3

a An illustration from 1QpHab

The text of Habakkuk 2:2 in the Masoretic rendering is:

And the Lord answered me and said, Write down the vision and inscribe it on tablets, so that anyone who reads it may run.

Here a prophecy is to be written down so that anyone who reads it, may take to his heels. The Qumran Pesher contains a lacuna precisely at the point where the biblical text is to be presented. But the biblical text appears again when its interpretation is given (1QpHab vii.2):

… so that the one who reads it, may make haste

As opposed to the Masoretic text, the article is used here with the participle Qal of כָּרָת, which makes the reader spoken of in the text a specific person. That

3 This, in turn, would of course also hold good for textual criticism where other evidence than that from Qumran creates such an intertextual effect.
expresses the interpretation provided in the Pesher, and as such provides a pivotal reading of the biblical text by the Qumran community. It contains the heart of the community’s doctrine of the Teacher of Righteousness, who was to be the one who at a later stage would read or recite to the people the meaning of Habakkuk’s vision. This is fully in accordance with the implication of the Hebrew text, notably that committing the vision to tables makes it a long term prophecy that would only be noticed as topical at a future time. Therefore it comes as no surprise that the commentary adds (1QpHab vii.3-4):

As for the fact that it says, so that the one who reads it, may make haste, its interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness to whom God has made known …

Is the comparison of these two traditions only a matter of establishing the ‘correct’ reading, with or without the article before the participle? Noting the reference to the Qumran reading in the critical apparatus of the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia and deciding that there is nothing wrong with the Masoretic form of the text, would normally be seen as a simple text-critical decision: the Masoretic text should not be emended. However, the issue at stake is not merely a matter of deciding whether to use the textual evidence of the Qumran Pesher as grounds for changing or not changing the Masoretic text, but requires an answer to a further question: whether there is anything ‘wrong’ with the Qumran form. Since the answer to this is also negative, it would mean ignoring a whole dimension of interpretation that has come to our notice if we were to continue with our own interpretation of ‘the’ Hebrew text on the assumption that only the Masoretic one is relevant. Since we have two texts bordering on each other within the ambit of our interpretive work, they relate to each other. This is the dialogue between texts referred to above.

b An illustration from a case of Masoretic pointing

These observations lead to the consideration of a phenomenon usually associated with textual criticism proper. Let us take an example in the Masoretic text involving vowel pointing, which must therefore be considered quite independently from Qumran. What is the meaning of ‘original’ via-à-vis ‘later’ and of ‘correct’ in matters of Ketib and Qere? The text is not visibly emended in its written form, but still read as though something other were actually written. This may sound like a trifle, but not only does the entrenchment of the phenomenon in the textual tradition of the Hebrew Bible point in another direction, the very principle we are considering is the same in this case. So it has to be considered what is to be done in the many cases where a Qere note by the Masoretes can lead to considerable differences in meaning. Where is the borderline between formation of the text and Interpretation? The distinction be-
tween so-called ‘lower’ and ‘higher’ criticism is long behind us, such cases marked by the Masoretes as well as analogous cases we find ourselves confronted with clearly show that textual criticism is a straightforward matter of interpretation itself and concerns all forms of exegesis, whether historical-critical or text-immanent. Even on the latter ticket a historical decision is not avoidable. It is a matter of deciding and explaining how \( x \) emerged from \( y \), and that is a diachronic matter. Both errors and obvious interpretations of earlier versions of the text occur in the so-called ‘final text’, so that we are compelled – even from the vantage point of textual Puritanism – to consider such issues. For instance, Song of Songs 1:5 reads:

I am dark but beautiful, o daughters of Jerusalem
like the tents of Qedar, like the fabric of Solomon.

Here the material of Solomon (παλιτζ) is intended by the pointed text. The parallelism of Shalma (παλιτζ) with Qedar is however too obvious to miss. The decision to read the ‘final’ text as a matter of synchronic principle nevertheless entails facing up to the necessity of having to reject an obvious close parallelism: as / like, tent / fabric, Qedar / Shalma, as well as their dark colour with the first stich’s reference to the dark colour of the woman from these precincts. It means accepting this reading as an aspect of the association of the whole text of the book with Solomon typical of the end phase of the formation of the text. Therefore it also means facing up to the question whether the book is only to be read as a Solomonic song because the ‘end phase’ was of this opinion in the service of a specific interpretation? Whatever the decision, it is historical even if it is made to appear otherwise, because it has to consider different phases of the formation process. Conversely, the opposite decision, to read ‘Shalma’ instead of ‘Solomon’ requires accounting for reconstructing a hypothetical earlier form of the text, but it enables the interpreter to read the whole book as a collection of erotic songs without recourse to later Jewish readings in the service of their own autonomous interpretation. On both counts the ‘immanent’ reading of a text cannot do without reconstructing what has been handed down to us.

If, as this example is intended to illustrate, the Masoretic ‘final’ text within itself bears the signs inviting more than one reading, this phenomenon should a fortiori be expected to occur extensively in the ‘final’ text as this was fixed in the witnesses to the biblical texts at Qumran, which is exactly what we could observe in our example from the Pesher Habakkuk.\(^5\)

\(^4\) : (proposal) / (text) יהיהויה יא הצעה מבית ורשתל שאלות שאלות שלמה שלמה

But our examples bring us to another facet of the interest we are pursuing in this paper: two texts bordering on each other, relating to each other and influencing our interpretation present a case of intertextuality.

c  Textual criticism as literary criticism

In that branch of philology of which it is a part, in German called ‘Editionsphilologie’ (that is, ‘edition philology’), textual criticism is usually understood to be the reconstruction of text units that can be read meaningfully, where the manuscript tradition seems to require this for understanding the text. Normally this is seen as a diachronic task, namely that the errors that have slipped into the written tradition be re-constructed. Therefore textual criticism in this sense works backwards in search of an earlier reading taken as better than a later, corrupted reading. The legitimacy and even necessity of such an approach cannot be denied. Errors can and do slip into the process of handing down the text and thereby obscure or blight the sense of the text. But the readings of so-called textual witnesses, that is, alternative instances attesting a different reading of a specific text, can also be meaningful synchronically. We need not necessarily be guided by the question what the ‘original’ reading was; we need not assume that the oldest reading must be the ‘correct’ one because it is the oldest. That would betray a kind of essentialist text concept, as if the ‘correct’ or ‘true’ reading of a text is somehow deposited in the oldest form of it. Such an attempt can however only be made when ‘correct’ is qualified to mean that the investigator wishes to determine the intention of the original author. This is a legitimate question to put to the text, but when it is declared or de facto treated as the only relevant one, it betrays a prejudgement of an essentialist nature, long no more acceptable in hermeneutics, philosophy or theology.

That would entail the text-critical version of what historical criticism often practised and is today often severely criticised for: presupposing in the fashion of historicism that the earliest shape is the ‘best’ and therefore the most important or even only relevant one for interpretation.

But textual criticism is in fact a literary matter, as it has all along been considered to be ‘edition philology’. That entails regarding textual variants in a fundamentally different way, not as variae lectiones to be chronologically retraced until the oldest or most original and therefore ‘correct’ text is arrived at, but as invitations to a discussion. The variegated readings thus constitute an implied appeal to the textual critic to facilitate an interactive relationship between them in which several different readings are put forward, none of whom needs to emerge as the victor in the end.6 To put it in the words of Ulrike Bail:7

---

7  Bail 2003:104. [I thank Dr Marianne Grohmann for the reference.]
Textual criticism [...] plumbs the polyvalence of texts, maps them out and opens a discussion between the texts, instead of giving preference to one single possibility. [...] Textual witnesses [...] are: different perspectives on a text, a verse, a word or even only on a vowel from the vantage point of their respective contexts.

According to my submission developed in this line, Qumran does not supply us primarily with material for the ‘correction’ of ‘wrong’ or ‘inaccurate’ readings, but rather hundreds of dialogue incentives. The text-critical relevance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for work on the Old Testament is therefore not at all limited to the endeavour of providing a ‘dependable text’ beforehand so that interpretation of that text can only then start. Quite on the contrary, as a literary activity it operates as an aspect of reception aesthetics and is therefore part of the interpretive process. In theological terms, textual criticism is not a preliminary activity to prepare the ground for exegesis, but itself is thoroughly part of exegesis. And as such it is not only a ‘step’ (not even the ‘first step’), as one can often read in introductions to exegetical methods, but an interpretive consideration woven through the whole of the interpretive process and therefore to be constantly reflected upon. By the same token, the variegated readings created, preserved and handed down by the tradition are not to be lamented as an obstacle to interpreters, but accepted as a challenge to recognise this as a positive phenomenon affording rich new possibilities for interpretation. If this is correct, it calls for a further question to be considered: the scrolls themselves as intertexts.

2 Scrolls as intertexts

The Dead Sea Scrolls perhaps afford one of the best instances of the meaning of the concept of intertextuality in biblical studies. They have a special relevance for scholarship interested in the literary study of these texts because by their very nature they lend a striking topicality to the concept of intertextuality.

This is in evidence all over the Dead Sea Scrolls and – since mainly biblical texts are concerned in this respect – biblical scholarship cannot but pay more attention to the phenomenon of intertextuality as it is exemplified in these texts. The biblical Pesharim of Qumran, of which we have considered an example, provide the most obvious case in point, since by their very nature they ex-
plicitly take up one text and create another one around it. Strictly speaking, the biblical commentaries therefore also have an intertextual character. However, the term ‘intertextual relationship’ is not normally used to refer to straightforward notes to one connected text, but to the interweaving of texts. This remains the case even though an argument can be made for a text-cum-notes to be a new one with intertextual character. But especially the testimonia and florilegia or testimonies and anthologies among the Dead Sea Scrolls are such obvious cases that I shall linger somewhat longer on my next example, notably a compendium of messianic texts from the Fourth Cave (4Q175).\textsuperscript{10}

\textbf{a \ An illustration from 4Q175}

In this text a number of passages from what we call ‘the’ Hebrew Bible are arranged in a specific order and rounded off with a further quotation from another Qumran text, the so-called Psalm of Joshua (4QPs Jos). This affords us several levels of intertextual relationships:

- First, two biblical texts from Deuteronomy are combined;
- then this combination is related to a passage from the Book of Numbers;
- third, these texts are connected to a further passage from Deuteronomy;
- fourth, these texts are again grafted onto the Psalm of Joshua; and
- on the fifth level, the psalm itself is in turn an intertextual fabric of psalmic material and the Book of Joshua.

The text:

\begin{verbatim}
\textit{i} [l 1-8]
The … spoke to Moses saying: ‘You have heard the words of this
people, which they have spoken to you; what they have spoken, is
right. If only their heart were like this, to fear me and to keep all my
commandments always, so that it might go well with them and with
their children forever!’ [Dt 5:28-29]

\textit{A prophet I will raise up for them from among their brethren like
you: I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak to them all
that I command him. Anyone who does not heed the words that the
prophet shall speak in my name, I myself will seek account from
him. [Dt 18:18-19]

\textit{ii} [l 9-13]
So he pronounced his utterance, saying: ‘The oracle of Balaam son
of Beor, the oracle of the man whose eye is clear, the oracle of one
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{10} First published: Allegro & Anderson 1968:57-60.
who hears the words of God, and knows the knowledge of the Most High, who has visions of the Almighty, who falls down, but with an uncovered eye: I see him, but not now; I behold him, but not near—a star shall stride forth from Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel; he shall crush the borderlands of Moab, and destroy all the sons of Sheth.’ [Nu 24:15-17]

iii [I 14-20]
And of Levi he said: ‘Give to Levi your Thummim, and your Urim to your loyal one, whom you tested at Massah, with whom you contended at the waters of Meribah; who said of his father and mother, “I do not know them”, and did not recognise his brethren, and did not know his son. For he observed your word, and kept your covenant. They enlighten your ordinances for Jacob, and Israel your law; they place incense before you, and whole burnt offerings on your altar. Bless, O …., his substance, and accept the work of his hands; crush the loins of his adversaries and of those who hate him, so that they do not rise again.’ [Dt 33:8-11]

iv [I 21-29]
At the time when Joshua had finished giving praise and thanks with his praises, he said: ‘Cursed be the man who builds this city. At the price of his firstborn he will lay its foundations, and at the price of his last-born he will set up its gates [Jos 6:26]. And see, an accursed man belonging to Belial will arise to be the nest of a bird-catcher unto his people and destruction to all his neighbours. And he shall arise [ ] to be the two of them instruments of violence. And they shall return and build [ ] and establish for it a wall and towers to make a stronghold of wickedness [ ] in Israel and an abomination in Ephraim, and in Judah [ ] shall make defilement in the land and great contempt among the sons of [ ] blood like water on the rampart of the daughter of Zion and within the boundary of Jerusalem.

The Testimonia, sometimes called the Messianic Collection, (4Q175) is a short document from Cave 4 dated to the early first century BCE. It consists of four sections built around what is often said to be five quotations—three from the Book of Deuteronomy, one from the Book of Numbers, and one from the Book of Joshua. That is, if one merely accepts that the intertext is part of what became the Masoretic Text. However, the two Deuteronomy texts occurring together in the first demarcated section of 4Q175 also occur together in the Sa-

maritan Pentateuch’s version of Exodus 20. This suggests that the Qumran document quotes from a biblical text of the Samaritan type and not from one in the tradition handed on in the Masoretic line. Accordingly, we would have only four quotations in the four sections of our document with each section built around a specific quotation. In this regard we can thus accept the suggestion by Skehan (1957:435) that the quotations match the order in which they appear in the Bible, notably Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy and Joshua in that order. The last quotation, from Joshua 6:26, is followed by an extended interpretation with the help of a doubly intertextual relationship, namely from the Book of Joshua as this in turn is taken up by the Psalm of Joshua.

- The first section, then, consists of a quotation from Exodus 20:18 or 22 rather than a conflation of two texts from Deuteronomy (5:28-29 and 18:18-19) referring to a prophet similar to Moses.

- The second is an extract from a prophecy of Balaam about a future royal figure (Numbers 24:15-17). This prophecy predicts that ‘a star shall stride forth from Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel; he shall crush the borderlands of Moab, and destroy all the sons of Sheth’, which is usually interpreted as a prophecy of the coming of the royal messiah.

- The third section is a blessing for Levi, and implicitly for the priestly messiah (Dt 33:8-11).

- The last section opens with a verse from Joshua (6:26), which is then expounded by means of a quotation from the sectarian Psalms of Joshua (cf. 4Q379).

It has been argued that this document is not concerned with messianic expectations, but rather with the contemporary situation of the Qumran community. I do not think the one excludes the other – indeed, the one fits the other quite well. The coming of the messianic Sprout of David is expected in the ‘the last of the days’ (4QFlor), but on the other hand the Teacher of Righteousness is active in the contemporary situation, which is also called ‘the last of the days’ (1QpHab 2,5-9).

The prophet from the Exodus quotation is obviously singular and is distinguished from ‘among their own people’, thereby presupposing his dis-

---

12 Ex 20:18 (Parry & Tov 2004 :135), 20:21/22 (London Polyglot; Skehan 1957:435; cf. Allegro 1957:57, who also refers to the Samaritan text, but makes no further use of the fact); at its end this verse also has a marking similar to the division sign at the endings of lines 8, 13 and 20 in 4Q175.
tinctiveness from the community as the true people of God, which precludes a collective interpretation. The expectation of a prophet to herald the coming of the two messiahs is well known in Qumran (for instance 1QS ix.14-15, 1QpHab vii.4-5; cf. also Mal 3:23-24), so that it is natural to expect the quotations that follow to have something to do with this.

The star and sceptre of the Numbers quotation similarly signify one person, since the verbs following to describe his actions are singular. In its contextual relationship to the Exodus quotation, the Numbers passage is flanked by the obviously singular prophetic figure and the singular priestly figure in the blessing invoked on Levi (Dt 33:8,11), where the singular is used throughout. Their intertextual relationship thus rules out any identification with the collective community in a prophetic role. This holds good despite 1QS i.3, which mentions ‘Moses and all his servants the prophets’, since this clearly refers to the biblical prophets and therefore does not warrant identification with the community itself as some kind of collective prophetic figure.

The Deuteronomy quotation in the penultimate section of the Testimony forms the second flank of the Numbers quotation. It refers to an ‘eschatological priest’ from Levi (apparently also in Albl’s interpretation), who is obviously the priestly messiah so clearly juxtaposed to the royal messiah in 1QS ix.10-11: ‘… until the coming of the prophet and the messiahs from Aaron and Israel’. After the plainly messianic Numbers quotation, this must also be messianic, for which the figure of the priestly messiah in Qumran is the evident candidate.

Albl (1999:89), while accepting the messianic quality of the Numbers quotation, suggests that the last quotation cannot be squared with a messianic interpretation. In my opinion this section can, on the contrary, very well be understood in messianic terms. It concerns the curse of Joshua on the rebuilding of the city of Jericho, intertextually made to refer to Jerusalem and the eschatological conflict, which can certainly be associated with the messiah. The Dead Sea Scrolls contain no rounded-off messianic theology, so that it is difficult to bracket out the last section of the Testimony for not fitting into ‘the’ messianic picture of Qumran. For instance, in 1QM the messiah has prophetic

16 The Numbers passage is so often used with messianic reference in the Dead Sea Scrolls (and the Testaments of the Patriarchs) that Maier & Schubert 1992:102 call it the very basis for the Qumran teaching of two messiahs. Cf. also Van der Woude 1957: passim, with a summary and list of references in the Dead Sea Scrolls, as well as the more recent study of the whole issue of the two messiahs under the significant title ‘The scepter and the star’, Collins 1995.

17 Fletcher-Louis points out that the reading in 4Q175 effectively ‘corrects’ the order in which Dt 33:8 (MT) refers to the Urim and Thummim’, since Dt 33:8 is the only passage in the MT in which Thummim stands before Urim (Fletcher-Louis 2002:227). This may perhaps be because of the root יְרָא ‘light’ in יְרֵא and the fact that the priest ‘enlightens’ the community (so also in Sir 45:17).
features, but does not seem to participate in the eschatological war. In 4Q174 and 4Q458 however he does have a military role. The sceptre in line 12 is so clearly associated with the Davidic messiah in the scrolls\(^\text{18}\) that it would be surprising if it were otherwise here. Maier & Schubert (1992:104) are to be agreed with that he is the fighting messiah \textit{par excellence}). The passage certainly refers to the eschatological struggle, as Albl claims, but this is also a messianic matter.

For these reasons the text before us is not just a ‘conflation’, which is normally used in a negative sense, but an intertextual interpretation of different aspects of the eschatological future expected by the community.\(^\text{19}\) The verses taken from the Bible thus exemplify the interest of the Qumran community in the Old Testament prophecies expected to be fulfilled in their own day, which was experienced as eschatological time. In any event, the intertextuality of our texts provides details about the motif. The messianic expectation comprised persons representing three facets: a prophetic, a royal and a priestly. In accordance with 1QS ix.10-15, the Testimony documents this from the Scriptures by means of an intertextual network from the perspective of the faith of the community (for which reason the term ‘Testimony’ for this genre of texts from the Fourth Qumran Cave is quite apposite).

The critical literature seems quite interested in the genetic relationships of such texts, especially for the question as to their lying at the root of the testimonial literature in early Christianity.\(^\text{20}\) But the relevance of the concept of

\(^{18}\) In Gn 49:10 it is a symbol for the royal tribe of Judah \textit{and} used in parallelism with the military token of the \textit{qqxm}, the commander’s staff. This verse is taken up in the Patriarchal Blessing (4Qpatr) and the \textit{qqxm} is explicitly interpreted as royal power (4Qpatr ii) and associated with the messiah as the Sprout of David (4Qpatr iv-v). The Sprout of David (Jr 23:5, 33:15ff, Ze 3:8, 6:12) was given a messianic interpretation in Qumran (cf. Van der Woude 1957:171-172). In CD vii.18-21 the star is interpreted before the quotation and the sceptre after it (cf. Brooke 1994:123f), while the sceptre is explicitly identified with the ‘Prince’ of the community and also seen as the one who ‘destroys all the sons of Seth’; cf. also 1QSa ii.14-15, where the royal messiah sits with his military officers in a subordinate position to the priestly messiah and the priests; cf. Maier & Schubert 1992:102.

\(^{19}\) So Brooke 1985:311-319, Albl 1999:89f, who see the figure of the royal messiah represented here, and Steudel, who regards all three figures as messianic (2000:937). The latter also makes the following important observation: ‘Interestingly, all three eschatological figures: prophet, king, and high priest, are also and exclusively in the Qumran literature found in 1QRule of the Community (1QS ix.11), in a manuscript that was copied by the same scribe who also wrote Testimonia (the passage represented by 1QS ix.11 is missing in earlier stages of the Rule of the Community redaction; see Rule of the Community (4Q259)’. Cf. also CD xii.23f; xiv.19; xix.10f; xx.,1)

\(^{20}\) Albl 1999 revived a positive view in comparison with earlier reservations such as those of Fitzmyer 1971:70ff.
intertextuality is rarely noticed with reference to these texts.\(^{21}\) What becomes apparent here, is that there is a mutual relationship between biblical texts that are not merely conflated, but reciprocally contribute to each other’s significance by limiting, extending, focusing and emending what they would mean in isolation – even within the canon of the same community. The intertextuality affords the text meanings that are not otherwise present in the same words. Since the genre of the Testimony is present in Classical literature, the New Testament and in Patristic texts, its presence in Qumran becomes very interesting. The analogy of the later uses of testimonies as models for composition may suggest that we here too have a basic sketch of the intertextual relationships that could be developed in more extended texts.\(^{22}\) Is it not possible that compilations of this kind underlie the texts used in larger compositions such as 1QH, 1QM or 1QS? The Hodayot hymns often show the patterns of psalmic models and of models from eschatological parts in the Book of Isaiah.\(^{23}\) The War Scroll, again, presents a basic design of offices and organisational units for the desert community which reflects the concern with order in the organisation of priestly offices and the arrangement of Israel in the desert as portrayed in the priestly material in the Pentateuch.\(^{24}\) We shall presently consider one illustration from the Community Rule. The intertextual relationships vary in scope with their manifold general (1QM), widely dispersed (1QH) or detailed (cf. on 1QS below) interconnectedness. Is it to be imagined that the composition of such larger works took place without preparation? Were they composed in Mozartian fashion, merely being penned down without any help from drafts, notes or basic text lists that were to mould the form and express the contents in their unique ways? I think it rather unlikely.

Let us pursue this further by reflecting on one more instance. My last example comes from such an extended text. The Qumran community’s Rules also teem with intertextual relationships. Again one instance will have to suffice to illustrate my point.


\(^{22}\) This possibility is considered by Albl 1999:90, 288 and seems to me to warrant further investigation, especially in the light of the fact that 4Q175 is not really a scroll, but only a sheet and, as Albl points out, is obvious for is awkward orthography as if intended as private notes.


\(^{24}\) Maier & Schubert 1992:245.
b An illustration from 1QS

The Community Rule contains a famous passage in the context of the admission ceremony (1QS i.18 – ii.18) in which the biblical priestly blessing from Numbers 6:24-26 is used intertextually in an extensive way, viz 1QS ii.1-9:

The priests shall bless all those of the lot of God, who walk faultless in all his ways, saying:
   May he bless you with all that is good
   and protect you from all that is evil!
   May he enlighten your heart with the wisdom of life
   and endow you with everlasting knowledge!
   May he lift the face of his kindness toward you for everlasting peace!

The Levites shall curse all those of the lot of Belial, saying:
   Accursed are you in all the wicked deeds of your guilt.
   God will give you terror by those who wreak vengeance,
   and visit you with destruction by the hands of those who practise retribution,
   Accursed are you without mercy for your dark deeds,
   and damned are you in the shadows of eternal flames.
   God will have no mercy on you when you cry out,
   and not forgive by atoning for your iniquity.
   He will lift up the countenance of his fury for vengeance against you,
   and there will never be peace for you in the mouth of any who intercede.

The intertextuality operates on three levels: First, the biblical text is quoted in an adapted form, both with additions and omissions. Second, it is turned on its head by means of parody. Third, the parody follows the structural example of another blessing and a curse in Deuteronomy 27:12-26 and 28:1-68.

Only a glance is necessary to see that the curse passage is much longer than the blessing. It is also more intense in that the optative use of the jussive occurs in the blessing (to be seen in the Hiphil form רַי), whereas the indicative form (with ולָ) instead of jussive (with רָי) is used in the curse. This can of course be explained in terms of the fact that the context in the Community Rule is the admission of novices. The warning is so vividly presented and so relentlessly drawn out that any idea of relapse is intimidated by it. But the adjacent combinations of blessings and curses in Deuteronomy 27 and 28 are built up with the same principle, notably that the blessing opens the passage, only to be followed by a much longer counterpart containing the curses. The two Deuteronomy chapters themselves relate to each other in this regard, but the former contains more material of importance for its reception in Qumran. There is, firstly, a clear division of blessings and curses themselves; distinct groups pro-

25 Because of her interest in liturgical conducting of a covenantal ceremony, Nitzan 1994:26 mentions only Dt 27 in this regard, but she does seem to regard the ‘literary-liturgical exegesis’ as a creative process.
nouncing them occur in the Community Rule as they do in the biblical text (Dt 17:12-13); the context is ceremonial in both cases; the Levites play an important role in the curses. On the other hand, Deuteronomy 28 contains the element of God’s unwillingness to forgive (v 12), that is, a rejection by him personally. All of this is thus seized upon by the Community Rule in that the motifs, the key term רָזָא and the emphasis on the curses are presented in terms of the community’s perceptions of its own religious world. In other words, the intertextual effect is that the biblical passages can be narrowed down in scope to have a specific function required for novices to the Qumran community.

But the most obvious intertextual relationship, that with the priestly blessing of the Book of Numbers, is in itself two-sided. On the one hand it has a positive effect in that it is carefully traced and extended in Qumran, and on the other its effect is that of a parody in that it is turned into its opposite. This is not done at random, but executed carefully by taking up the impulse of the Deuteronomy texts and then following the rhythm of the Numbers text. For these reasons the Rule passage acquires a powerful effect in the light of the intertextual relationships that were clearly very important and well-known to the community.

The biblical text consists of six sentences with one wish each, neatly grouped in pairs and containing the divine name only in the first sentence of each pair. But in the Qumran blessing the last pair is collapsed into a single sentence. That avoids the anthropomorphism in the biblical text:

May the Lord lift up his face over you and give you peace

becomes

May he lift the face of his kindness toward you for everlasting peace.

Not only anthropomorphism is avoided in the Qumran text, but also the divine Name, despite its symmetrically repeated occurrence in the first of every pair of blessings in the Numbers text itself. However, this creates no difficulty for understanding the Qumran blessing, since in that context only God can be the subject (cf. כָּנָא in line 6, that is, the second line of the first curse-pair). But the most important effect of the intertextual appropriation is reflected in its new structure. In this way an uneven number of wishes is created, so that it becomes possible for one of them to be and flanked by two others and thereby to be placed exactly in the middle of the blessing. The wish ‘May he enlighten your heart with the wisdom of life’ is thus underscored by being made the centre of the blessing. The fact that God enlightens with life-giving knowledge, is the epicentre of what new members could expect.

---

The same happens in the extended parody of the curse in as far as the principle of curse-pairs allows it. Disregarding the first curse, we have four pairs consisting of a curse and an extension introduced by the conjunction \( \wedge \). Thereby the double curse,

\[
\text{Accursed are you without mercy for your dark deeds, and damned are you in the shadows of eternal flames}
\]

is centred in the curse, being flanked as it is by two curse units of 20 words each on either side.

The centre of the blessing is turned into a wish in which the concept of light is the focal point, and the centre of the curse becomes an invective arranged around the concept of darkness. The very duality of the parody reflects the dualism of light and darkness so central to the faith of Qumran. Thereby the second person of the parodic blessing becomes an address to the Sons of Light, whereas the second person in the curse addresses the Sons of Darkness.\(^{27}\)

It seems to me that this extensive and intensive use of the biblical tradition works both ways in a highly creative way. First, central aspects of the community’s theology are obviously given a biblical base.\(^ {28}\) The doctrine of the dualism between light and darkness, good and evil, is expressed in terms of Numbers 6 through the lens of Deuteronomy 27 and 28. But by the same token the community’s self-understanding is established on the same biblical foundation, since the former is the social expression of the principle of light. By virtue of its exclusivity, those outside the community must be the expression of the principle of darkness, that is, evil in the flesh. To achieve this, a large measure of creativity, the courage and the will to put it to practice are necessary.

C INTERTEXTUALITY AND THEOLOGIANS READING THE SCROLLS

‘Intertextuality’ can mean several things, depending on a vantage point taken from Julia Kristeva or Roland Barthes.\(^ {29}\) Since the very nature of the Dead Sea Scrolls is marked by an intense relationship to the Hebrew Scriptures, they have an intertextual character in the sense of the interrelationship of texts referring to and influencing one another. It is in this general sense that I have used the term in this paper. It stresses that texts do not stand in isolation, but in the context of other texts. The simplest form of such intertextuality is the well-


\(^{28}\) Kugler 2002:131-152 argues for scriptural exegesis at Qumran as the basis of its ritual practices generally.

known phenomenon of ‘literary dependence’, where a younger text is influenced by an older one or where the younger one hands down the older one in an interpreted form. This may be of an osmotic nature, where influence flows mainly in one direction, but the influencing text does not remain unaffected. Intertextual relationships of texts achieve a further dimension when such texts are received by readers who place them alongside or within their own texts. When more than one text is so received, they are not only related to the interpreter’s text, but also to each other. The received texts then border on each other, therefore limit each other and therefore, again, affect each other. These relationships are therefore reciprocal, where the effects work both ways, so that a kind of dialogue ensues, similar to the dialogue mooted for textual variants by Ulrike Bail. So it does seem that my claim as to the deepest literary nature of textual criticism is confirmed by the illustrations of our other Qumran examples. The style of one may appear in a new light when seen in the context of the style of another, the one may criticise or adapt the other, and explicit or even obscured quotations from the one in the other may lend a new dimension of meaning to both.

What have the people of Qumran achieved in doing just that?

- I submit that they have not only ‘shown’ what their historically determined feud with mainstream currents within Judaism of the time looked like or what they thought about themselves. On the religio-historical level they of course do offer us such information.

- But on the literary and theological levels they offer us more. Having undergone the influence of earlier biblical texts, they have also reciprocated this influence:

  - They have foregrounded that one of the most prominent blessing texts in the Bible cannot be extracted and one-sidedly projected to mirror only ‘blessing’ as part of Israel’s faith. They have shown that God’s blessing is part of a network of texts where it is outweighed quantitatively by its negative counterpart. Thereby they have presented our all too overbearing scholarly exegesis with an important challenge.

  - They have also reminded us that truth is not just encoded in the biblical text waiting to be decoded, but that the faith of the reader must necessarily be the prism through which our texts respond to their biblical intertexts.

  - And in so doing, they have demonstrated the necessity and the power of creativity in relating to Holy Scriptures. Once again, it becomes appar-
ent that the theological use of texts is an aesthetical matter, whether one likes the music or not and whether one can sing along or not.
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