

MINIMIZING AND MULTIPLYING MESSIAHS IN THE MANUAL OF DISCIPLINE

Dr. Carl N. Toney
Hope International University

INTRODUCTION

The *Rule of the Community* (1QS) 9.11 reads עַד בּוֹא נְבִיא וּמְשִׁיחֵי אֶהְרֹן וְיִשְׂרָאֵל which F. García Martínez provides a typical translation of “until the prophet comes, and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.”¹ The current consensus view interprets the plural “anointed ones” (מְשִׁיחֵי) as two titles indicating that there are two messianic figures—a priestly Messiah (messiah of Aaron) and a kingly Messiah (messiah of Israel).² Because this is the only occurrence of “anointed one” (מְשִׁיחֵי) in 1QS, scholars typically dig through the rest of the Sectarian Documents of Qumran (SDQ) in order to ascertain the meaning and significance of this term.³ However, looking through other SDQ literature presents its own sets of challenges. Most notably, the Damascus Document’s (CD) references to one messiah of Aaron and Israel gets used as an interpretive grid for 1QS.⁴

This paper seeks to reopen the interpretive question of 1QS 9.11. A fundamental question that needs to be asked is why should מְשִׁיחֵי be interpreted as “messiahs” rather than as “anointed ones?” Further, this paper seeks to make a call back to W. H. Brownlee’s initial interpretation⁵ which has been largely rejected by most scholars and even Brownlee himself.⁶ Brownlee originally saw the prophet as the “messiah” and the “anointed ones” as his eschatological community of followers. While in general agreement, this paper seeks to modify Brownlee’s position. 1QS did not employ “messianic” categories for its leaders, so it is better to avoid messianic language. Thus, the Prophet is the eschatological leader and the “anointed ones of Aaron” are the priests in the Community and the “anointed ones of Israel” are either the Community’s laity or Levites.

1. GENERAL PROBLEMS

There are some general problems with the phrase וּמְשִׁיחֵי אֶהְרֹן וְיִשְׂרָאֵל (“anointed ones of Aaron and Israel”). First, the context of 1QS 9.11 does not provide us with enough information

¹ All translations from García Martínez *DSS Study Edition* and typically changing “messiah(s)” to “anointed one(s).”

² E.g., Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 77; Fitzmyer, *One Who Is to Come*, 89–90; Fitzmyer, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 82–86; Cross, *Ancient*, 158–159; Milik, *Ten Years*, 123–24; Peuch, “Messianism,” 237; Priest, “Mebaqqer,” 55; Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 8; VanderKam, “Messianism,” 212, 220, 234; Vermes, *DSS*, 86; Wernberg-Møller, *Manual*, 135–136.

³ E.g., VanderKam, “Messianism,” 211. Wernberg-Møller constantly draws upon CD and other documents for determining meaning in 1QS (*Manual*). Collins notes when dealing with the tension between one messiah in CD and two in 1QS that objecting to two messiahs “rests on the interpretation of the phrase “messiah of Aaron and Israel in CD” (*Apocalypticism*, 77).

⁴ Wernberg-Møller, *Manual*, 135–136.

⁵ Brownlee, *Dead Sea Manual*, 34–35, 50.

⁶ Brownlee, “Messianic Motifs,” 198–199.

to clearly ascertain the manner in which משיח (“anointed one”) is being used. Second, 1QS does not provide any additional aid, since this is the only place in 1QS where the term exists. In a related manner, this entire clause is missing from another copy of the *Rule of the Community*, 4QS^e (4Q259), which jumps from 8.15 to 9.12.⁷

Third, this is the only place in the SDQ and the Hebrew Bible (HB) where the entire phrase occurs that identifies two “anointed ones.”⁸ In the HB, there are three groups of people “anointed,” the priests (e.g., Lev 4:3), king (e.g., 1 Sam 2:10, 35; 2 Tim 22:51; cf. Ps 2:2; 18:50 [51]; 20:6 [7]; 28:8; 84:9 [10]; 89:38 [39], 51 [52]; 105:15; 132:10, 17), and prophets (Ps 105:15). While “Anointed One” is never used as a formal title, kings are referred to as the Lord’s Anointed. The only non-Jewish person anointed is Cyrus (Isa 45:1). Daniel 9:25, 26 place this “anointed one” within an eschatological matrix.

Looking for the closest parallels in the HB to “anointed ones of Aaron,” we discover that Aaron is “anointed” (מָשַׁח, Exod 28:41; 29:7; 30:30; 40:13, 15; Lev 6:20; 7:36; 8:12) with “oil” (מִשְׁחָה, Exod 29:7, 21, 29; Lev 8:12, 30). Further, his successors, in the high priestly line are also “anointed” (מָשַׁח, Lev 16:32; Num 35:25) with “oil” (מִשְׁחָה, Lev 21:10, 12; 21:12), and more broadly we have “anointed priests” (הַכֹּהֲנֵי הַמְּשֻׁחִים, Lev 4:3, 5, 16; 6:22; cf. Exod 40:15). However, while “anointing” is associated with Aaron, this concept is not ever formulated as a title “anointed of Aaron.”⁹

Also, while the HB does describe the king as “anointed *over* Israel” (מְשַׁחֵךְ עַל-יִשְׂרָאֵל, 1 Sam 15:1, 17; 2 Sam 5:3, 17, 12:7; 1 Kgs 1:34; 19:16; 1 Chr 11:3), the HB does not use “anointed *of* Israel” as a title. Further, the HB does not ever pair the anointing of Aaron with the anointing of Israel. Priestly and Aaronic anointing texts are confined to Exodus to Numbers. “Kingly/Israel anointing” texts are all outside the Pentateuch and mainly focused on 1–2 Samuel, 1–2 Kings, 1–2 Chronicles, and Psalms.

⁷ Metso (*Textual Development*, 72–74) favors 4Q259 reflecting the more original form. However, C.-H. Hunzinger, “Beobachtungen zur Entwicklung,” 242–43 and others argue this was intentionally omitted. While VanderKam (“Messianism in the Scrolls,” 213) argues that this is a form of haplography because of the common words in 8.15 and 9.13. (לְעִשׂוֹת אֶת רִצּוֹן אֱלֹהֵי כְּכֹל הַנְּגִלָה לְעֵת בְּעַתָּה, 8.15) (לְעִשׂוֹת אֶת רִצּוֹן אֱלֹהֵי כְּכֹל הַנְּגִלָה לְעֵת בְּעַתָּה, 9.13). The problem for this theory is that the copyist “resumed” with 9.12 not 9.13.

⁸ It does not even appear in any of the fragments 4Q255–264 (Notably 4Q259 skips this reference. 4Q256 and 4Q258 are also missing this reference but it is difficult to know if it would have been present, since it is part of the fragmented material). See Alexander and Vermes, *DJD XXVI*, 11. VanderKam (“Messianism,” 212–13) rightly rejects speculation regarding early and late forms of 1QS (e.g., Milik, *Ten Years*, 123–24; Schiffmann, “Messianic Figures,” 120).

⁹ מָשַׁח and derivatives can be divided into groups around the inauguration of the priesthood and tabernacle between Exod 25:6—Num 7:88 (54x) and the inauguration of the kingship between 1 Sam 2:10—1 Kgs 5:1[15] (34x). Three times for prophets (1 Kgs 19:16; 1 Chron 16:22; Ps 105:15). There are four non-ritualistic uses (2 Sam 1:21; Isa 21:5; Jer 22:14; Amos 6:6) and four non-initiation uses connected to ritual and worship (Exod 29:2; Lev 2:4; 7:12; Num 6:15). All occurrences of special anointing oil מִשְׁחָה (adj.) are found in Exodus to Numbers (21x) e.g., Exod 25:6; 37:29; Lev 8:12).

For the SDQ, the closest verbal parallel comes from CD 20.1 and 12.23 which uses the phrase “until the Messiah of Aaron and Israel comes” (עד עמוד משיח מאהרן ומישראל).¹⁰ However, there are two major differences which must keep us from making too quick a jump into parallels. First, in CD, “anointed one” (משיח) is only in the singular.¹¹ Second, CD is also missing the prophet figure.

Thus, CD has one figure in mind while 1QS potentially mentions at three (the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel plus the Prophet). We will return to a discussion of SDQ parallels later including a discussion of the “messianic” figures in 1QSa. At this point, we simply want to note the problematic nature of the 1QS text and the difficulty of making parallels. Fourth, the parsing of the term “anointed ones” (משיחי) can either be plural or dual, so the number of “anointed ones” is ambiguous.¹² All these general problems make this phrase ripe for discussion.

2. NEITHER “ANOINTED ONE” IS DAVIDIC

We NT scholars are especially guilty of looking for messianic parallels during Second Temple times because we want to better understand Jesus *Christ*. While the exact phrase, “anointed one(s) of Israel” (ומשיחי ... וישראל), does not occur in the HB, the HB does speak of Davidic kings as “anointed over Israel” (מִשְׁחָהּ עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל, 1 Sam 15:1, 17; 2 Sam 5:3, 17, 12:7; 1 Kgs 1:34; 19:16; 1 Chr 11:3). Also, David (e.g., 2 Sam 2:4; 3:39; 19:21; 22:51; 2 Chr 22:7; Ps 2:2) and other kings are referred to as “anointed ones.”¹³ Some would argue that 1QS 9.11 appears to be taking on this title. Thus, it is quite *plausible* that 1QS is creating a shorthand title in reference back to this HB tradition and this title would be a King-Messiah.¹⁴

However, there is a major problem with this theory for understanding 1QS. It relies upon external evidence without any internal support from 1QS. 1QS lacks any reference to a Davidic messiah. Even in John Collins’s *Scepter and Star*, who uses an expansive set of characteristics (not just the term messiah), cannot find traces of a Davidic messiah in 1QS.¹⁵ L. Schiffman rightly notes regarding 1QS, “The Messiah of Israel is nowhere said to be Davidic.... Neither David nor Davidic descent plays any role whatsoever.”¹⁶ In fact, there is no Davidic or kingly interest in 1QS. Without any interest prior or after 1QS 9:11, it is extremely unlikely that 1QS

¹⁰ CD 12:23 has a slightly different wording (עד עמוד {משוח} <משיח> אהרן) but is essentially the same as 20:1. CD 14.19 is based on a reconstruction, so it is not counted as reliable evidence for an argument.

¹¹ See Collins’ discussion of the debate between one Messiah (e.g., Abegg, “Messiah at Qumran,” 125–44) and two (e.g., Collins, *Scepter and the Star*, 80–83).

¹² VanderKam, (“Messianism,” 211) notes the ambiguity of the text. *pace* Milik’s claim that “grammatically this [i.e., three persons] is the only possible interpretation” (*Ten Years*, 124).

¹³ Studies on Davidic messiah’s abound. Schiffman (*Eschatological Community*, 1–9) is an example of someone who begins his study of 1QS by defining a Davidic messiah and attempting to fit 1QS into this mold.

¹⁴ E.g., Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 77; Cross, *Ancient*, 158–159; Milik, *Ten Years*, 123–24, 127; Peuch, “Messianism,” 237; Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 8; VanderKam, “Messianism,” 212, 220, 234; Vermes, *DSS*, 86; Wernberg-Møller, *Manual*, 135–136.

¹⁵ Collins, *Scepter and the Star*, 61–78. Although, he tries to use 4Q175 as the “scriptural” underpinning for 1QS 9.11 (79–80).

¹⁶ Schiffman, “Messianic Figures,” 120.

9:11 would be making an allusion to Davidic hopes. Since 1QS has no Davidic hopes, the “anointed one(s) of Israel” in 1QS 9.11 cannot and should not refer to a King-Messiah.

3. “ANOINTED ONES” ARE PRIESTLY

Many scholars have noted the priestly focus of 1QS where the priests are the leaders of the Community.¹⁷ The priestly leadership is seen, for example, by the priests’ separation from the others in the Community. Note the following citations regarding Community gatherings:

The **priests** shall enter in order foremost, one behind the other, according to their spirits. And the **Levites** shall enter after them. In the third place all the **people** (םעה) shall enter in order...so that each Israelite may know his standing in God’s Community in conformity with an eternal plan (2.19b–23a).

This is the Rule for the session of the Many. Each one by his rank: the **priests** will sit down first, the **elders** next and the **remainder** of all the people (םעה) will sit down in order of rank (6.8b–9a).

In the case of both the above citations, the community is separated into three groups: the priests, the Levites/elders, and the people. In this separation, the priests are separated and given a place of prominence within the Community.¹⁸ Hints of the priests’ distinctiveness also arise in the Community’s rules. There are specific offenses against priests (7.2b–3a)¹⁹ versus offenses against “fellow” members (7.4, 6, 12, 15, 17).

The prominent position of the priests reflects their place of authority within the Community. Note the following citations:

This is the rule for the men of the Community...[to] acquiesce to the authority of the sons of Zadok, the priests who safeguard the covenant /and/ to the authority of the multitude of the men of the Community (5.1–3a).

Whoever enters the council of the Community...shall swear with a binding oath to revert to the Law of Moses...in compliance with all that has been revealed of it to the sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant and interpret his will and to the multitude of men of their covenant (5.7b–9).

The importance of these citations is emphasized in 1QS because they are considered by some to be additions to the tradition of 1QS, which heightened the role of the Zadokite priests.²⁰ By the time of 1QS, there is a real sense that the priests are the authority figures. Thus, this internal evidence points to the *possibility* that the “anointed ones” are priests.

This internal evidence also gives us *permission* to look for external support from the HB and SDQ that would link “anointing” with priestly positions. 1QS’s priestly interest and focus upon a return to the Torah does offer a precedent for looking within Levitical material for

¹⁷ E.g., Priest, “Mebaqqer,” 50; Vermes, *DSS*, 28–29; Three groups mentioned in the following verses: priests, Levites, and laity (Wernberg-Møller, *Manual*, 56). Note: the priests were leaders, but not all Community members were priests. The Community gatherings describe three groups—the priests, the Levites, and the people (*pace* Charlesworth, *Rule of the Community*, 17–19).

¹⁸ 1QS 6.18b–19a also shows the priest’s separation when it says, “And if the lot results in his entering the inner council of the Community according to the priests and the majority of the men of their covenant...”

¹⁹ “And if he has spoken angrily against one of the priests enrolled in the book, he will be punished for one year and shall be excluded” (7.2b–3a).

²⁰ e.g., Metso, *Textual Development*, 114–15.

support of such ideas. Interestingly, one finds that priests are anointed in the Pentateuch's priestly material only. This fits with 1QS's general outlook and call back to the Mosaic Law and expectation of priestly holiness practices for all members of the Community.²¹

4. "ANOINTED ONES" ARE THE COMMUNITY MEMBERS

So far we have indicated that no "anointed" figure(s) in the phrase "anointed ones of Aaron and Israel" (ומשיחי אהרון וישראל) is/are a Davidic messiah. We have also indicated that the phrase "anointed ones of Aaron" most likely refers to some priestly persons. However, we have *not* argued that these "anointed ones" are two individuals or leaders.

We will now look closer at the phrase and argue that "anointed ones" refers to two groups of Community members. As initially noted, the ambiguous form of the word "anointed ones" (משיחי) does allow the possibility for the term to be interpreted as referring to a group of people rather than to two specific individuals. Although "anointed ones" is ambiguous and is not used elsewhere in 1QS, the other two terms Aaron and Israel are paired together in several places.²² It is from these texts that we will determine the interpretation of "anointed ones."

1QS 8.4b–6

We will begin with 1QS 8.4b–6 because it is generally uncontested as being from the same redactional layer (stage 1 [Murphy-O'Connor; Metso])²³ as 9.11. It says:

When these exist in Israel
the Community council shall be founded on truth,
to be an everlasting plantation, a holy house for Israel (בית קודש ליישראל)
and the foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron (קודש קודשים לאהרון),
true witnesses for the judgment and chosen will... (8.4b–6).

8.4b–6 has a clear parallelism between Aaron and Israel. Israel's "holy house" clearly parallels Aaron's "holy of holies." Both these expressions are describing the temple or the tabernacle.²⁴

The "holy of holies" describes the innermost chamber of the temple/tabernacle (e.g., Exod 26:34; 1 Kgs 6:16; 1 Chr 6:49). The HB is full of references of "house" for the temple (e.g., 1 Kgs 3:2; 2 Kgs 23:27; 2 Chr 1:18; Dan 5:3; Ezra 4:24) and tabernacle (e.g., Exod 23:19; Lev 16:17).²⁵ The HB also uses "holy house" for the tabernacle (e.g., Lev 16:2) and temple (1 Kgs 15:15; 2 Chr 3:8, 10; 2 Chr 24:7; Isa 64:10). "Holy house" paralleled with "holy of holies"

²¹ 1QS focused on Pentateuch (Milik, *Ten Years*, 125).

²² In terms of redaction, according to Metso, all these references belong to the first stage along with 9.11. Murphey-O'Connor and J. Pouilly see 8.4b–6, 7b–10 as part of stage 1 along with 9.11. Aaron and Israel material continues to be added as the tradition develops: 5.6 is part of stage 3 and 5. 20b–22 are part of stage 4.

²³ Murphy-O'Connor, "Community Rule," ABD, s.v.; Metso, *Textual Development*.

²⁴ Some scholars interpret this as the temple consisting of the priests and laity (Leaney, *The Rule*, 95; Wernberg-Møller, *Manual*, 124–25). Although not argued here, the tabernacle references *could* indicate that the community saw themselves as the tabernacle rather than the temple.

²⁵ BDB s.v.

cements this interpretation.²⁶ Thus, 8.4b–6 says that the Community is to become the temple. It is a temple for the general nation, Israel, and it is a temple for the priests.

Further, “holy house” as a general reference to the temple and “holy of holies” as a reference to the innermost chamber of the temple makes sense in light of the division of the priests from the rest of the Community in 1QS. Both groups are holy, but the priests hold pride and place. The Community’s priests will serve as the holy of holies for Israel’s priests, and the Community in general will serve as the temple for Israel. Its purpose will be to stand as a witness of judgment. Thus, the Community is divided into two groups—the priests (Aaron) and the general session (Israel).²⁷

1QS 8.7b–10a

The foundation language is developed further in 1QS 8.7b–10a (also stage 1) which says:

This (the Community) is the tested rampart,
the precious cornerstone that does not /whose foundations/ shake or tremble from their place.
[It will be] the most holy dwelling for Aaron (לְאֹהֲרֹן) with eternal knowledge of the covenant of justice
and in order to offer a pleasant /aroma/;
and it will be a house of perfection and truth in Israel (בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל)
in order to establish {/.../} a covenant in compliance with the everlasting decrees (8.7b–10a).

Here again, Aaron and Israel are paired with references to the temple.²⁸ The Community is being described as a temple “for Aaron” (לְאֹהֲרֹן) and “in Israel” (בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל). Although there are two different prepositions being used to relate Aaron and Israel with the temple, there is still a similar relationship as seen in the previous verses. First, the temple is for Aaron, i.e., the specific group of priests. Second, the temple is also for the rest of the people in Israel, hence it is described in Israel. Once again, the Community’s division of priests (Aaron) and the general session (Israel) fits with this division. The Community acts as a temple for the dual purpose of judgment of the wicked *and* atonement for the land.²⁹

1QS 5.6

1QS 5.6 (stage 1 by Metso; stage 3 by Murphy-O’Connor) says:

They [the Community] should make atonement for all who freely volunteer
for holiness in Aaron (לְקֹדֶשׁ בְּאֹהֲרֹן)
and for the house of truth in Israel (וּלְבֵית הָאֱמֶת בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל)
and for those who join them for community, lawsuit and judgment (5.6).

Again, Aaron and Israel are paired together to describe Community members. This passage is talking about new members. Volunteers, which wish to join the Community may join either the

²⁶ Note: the expression “holy house *for* Israel” (בֵּית קֹדֶשׁ לְיִשְׂרָאֵל) is different from the expression “house of Israel” (בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל) which can refer to an Israelite (e.g., Lev 17:8).

²⁷ Priest (“Mebaqqer,” 56) sees Aaron and Israel designating two groups (priestly and lay) in the Community.

²⁸ Wernberg-Møller (*Manual*, 127) notes the “Aaron-Israel” pairing reflects texts dealing with the “anointed one” which he calls the Messiah.

²⁹ Wernber-Møller (*Manual*, 127) notes the Community being conscience of being a sacrifice.

“holiness in Aaron” or “the house of truth in Israel.” Or, they may participate more tangentially “for community, lawsuit, and judgment.”³⁰

1QS 5.20b–22

Another passage that pairs Aaron and Israel is 5.20b–22 (Metso: stage 1; Murphy-O’Connor: stage 4). 1QS 5.20b–22 says:

And when someone enters the covenant to behave in compliance with all these decrees...
...they shall examine their spirits in the Community...
...under the authority of the sons of **Aaron**,
those who freely volunteer in the Community to set up his covenant
and to follow all the decrees which he commanded to fulfill,
and under the authority of the majority of **Israel**,
those who freely volunteer to return within the Community to his covenant (5.20b–22).

This passage is also describing new Community members.³¹ These new members must examine their spirits under the authority of two groups—“the sons of Aaron” and “the majority of Israel.” Both of these groups are defined in relationship to the Community. Thus, here again, we see Aaron and Israel being identified with two groups within the Community.

1QS 9.3–11

From the examined passages, we can see that 1QS has a clear pattern of pairing Aaron and Israel in order to describe two groups (not individuals) within the Community. Overall that pattern is to describe the priestly group as “Aaron” and the lay group as “Israel.” We will now turn to 9.11 and examine it within context. 1QS 9.3–11 says:

³When these exist in **Israel** in accordance with these rules
in order to establish the spirit of holiness in truth ⁴eternal,
in order to atone for the guilt of iniquity
and for the unfaithfulness of sin,
and for approval for the earth,
without the flesh of burnt offerings
and without the fats of sacrifice – the offering of ⁵the lips
in compliance with the decree
will be like the pleasant aroma of justice and the perfectness of behaviour
will be acceptable like a freewill offering –
at that moment the men of ⁶the Community shall
set apart a holy house for **Aaron** (בית קודש לאהרון), in order to form a most holy community,
and a house of the Community for **Israel** (ובית יחד לישראל), those who walk in perfection.
⁷Only the sons of **Aaron** will have authority in the matter of *judgment* and of *goods*,
GOODS:
and their word will settle the lot of all provision for the men of the Community
⁸and the goods of the men of holiness who walk in perfection.

³⁰ Alternatively, if we see this passage describing three community groups, then we must keep in mind the codes for the order in the gathering of the community (2.19b–23a; 6.8b–9a [see above]). If we read this threefold division in light of that scheme, we can identify Aaron with the “priests,” “Israel” with the “Levites,” and “those who join them for community, lawsuit and judgment” with the general members. Although it could be argued from this passage that Israel refers to the Levites not just the general session, the main point is that Aaron and Israel reflect groups of people within the Community.

³¹ Wernberg-Møller, *Manual*, 97.

Their goods must not be mixed with the goods of the men of deceit who ⁹have not cleansed their path to separate from injustice and walk in a perfect behaviour.

JUDGMENT:

They should not depart from any counsel of the law
in order to walk ¹⁰ in complete stubbornness of their heart, but
instead shall be ruled by the first directives which the men of the Community
began to be taught

¹¹until the prophet comes, and the anointed ones of **Aaron** and **Israel** (9.3–11).³²

9.3–5 sets the stage. 9.3 refers to Israel alone (not in a pair) and is simply a generic reference to the nation. The Community is to be a temple during the apostate times. It provides the temple services of sacrifice and offerings, but without animals. It will become a symbolic temple, and their deeds will atone for the guilty.

It is in the midst of this temple description of the Community that the pairing of Aaron and Israel occurs. This pairing matches the language used in 8.4b–6. The “house of the Community for Israel” is paralleled with this the temple language “holy house for Aaron” which indicates that it is also describing the temple. Thus, once again Aaron and Israel are being used to subdivide groups within the Community.

The proximity of the description in 9.6 to 9.11 indicates that the “anointed of Aaron and Israel” are also associated with groups within the Community. The plural “anointed” language makes further sense and does not so starkly stand when it is contextualized with the priestly and temple language. After all, in the Pentateuch, it is the “anointed priests” (הַכֹּהֲנִים הַמְּשִׁיחִים) (Lev 4:3, 5, 16; 6:22) who offer sacrifices for atonement in the temple (e.g., Lev 1:4–5; 4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:6). We can also draw support for understanding the Community as “anointed of Israel” from Habbakuk 3:13 describes God’s people as his “anointed ones” (מְשִׁיחֵי).³³

This priestly “atonement” language is also affirmed by 9.7–10 which focuses on the special tasks of the sons of Aaron in the Community. The sons of Aaron have responsibilities over matters of Community goods (9.7b–9a) and judgments (9.9b–10). By focusing on the sons of Aaron, the author implicitly identifies at least two groups within the Community (sons of Aaron; i.e., the priests and others). The sons of Aaron are essentially put in charge “until the Prophet comes with the two groups of “anointed ones”—“Aaron” (i.e., priests) and “Israel” (i.e., the general session of the Community).” This reading identifies the “anointed ones” with these two groups of Community members. With these groups identified, we can now turn to the issue of the Prophet.

5. THE PROPHET AS ESCHATOLOGICAL LEADER

John Priest once wrote in his article on the 1QS messiahs, “Consideration of the rôle of and the identification of the prophet is not germane to our present discussion.”³⁴ Such a rhetorical dismissal arbitrary cuts away a crucial piece of the phrase. Significantly, 9.11 has the only singular reference to a “prophet” (נְבִיא) in 1QS, but the definite plural “prophets” (הַנְּבִיאִים) occurs twice in 1.3; 8.16.

³² Note: I changed Martínez translation from “Messiahs” to “anointed ones.”

³³ Brownlee (, 36) made this initial connection.

³⁴ Priest, “Mebaqqer,” 55.

Since 1.3 is likely part of redacted liturgical material, we will first look at 8.16a which is part of the core of 1QS. 1QS 8.15–16a says,

¹⁵This is the study of the law wh[i]ch he commanded through the hand of Moses, in order to act in compliance with all that has been revealed from age to age, ¹⁶and according to what the **prophets** (הַנְּבִיאִים) have revealed through his holy spirit. (8.15–16a).

1QS 8.15–16a links the prophets with the giving of the Mosaic law. This law is what the Community is expected to follow. The law is established by Moses and revealed by the prophets through the holy spirit. Thus, the prophets act in continuity with Moses.³⁵ They are acting in the traditional prophetic role as brokers of the covenant. In light of this verse, the “prophet” of 9.11 is at least someone who is expected to come and reveal, that is interpret, the law for the community through the holy spirit.

1QS 1.3 is best understood as part of the opening material of the liturgy and 1QS. These verses say,

For [the Instructor...]. . .for his life, [book of the Ru]le of the Community: in order to seek ²God with [all (one’s) heart and] with a[ll (one’s) soul;] in order to do what is good and just in his presence, as ³he commanded by the hand of Moses and by the hand of all his servants the **prophets** (הַנְּבִיאִים); in order to love everything ⁴which he selects and to hate everything that he rejects...

1QS 1.3 is sympathetic to the prophet reference in 8.16 and serves to highlight the role of the prophets in relationship to Moses. Here again the prophets are seen as those who reveal the law alongside Moses.³⁶ They give the law which the Community is expected to obey.

Thus, both 1QS 8.15–16 and 1.3 distinguish the role of prophets as revealers of the law who meditate the covenant for the Community.³⁷ At the very least, in 1QS 9.11, the “prophet” has a similar function. He comes to reveal the law for the Community in the last days. Prior to his coming, the priests (sons of Aaron) have had the responsibility of upholding the law in the Community (9.7–10). Proper interpretation of the law is extremely important for the Community (e.g., 5.9, 11; 6.6, 7; 8.12), so it makes sense that their expectation would focus on a figure who would interpret the law.

We might ask why this responsibility has shifted from prophets (plural) to a prophet (singular)? Within 1QS, the precedent for an individual instructor of the Law arises with language of the “Instructor” (מַשְׁכִּיל, 3.13; 8.16; 9.12; poss. 1.1).³⁸ Thus, the “Prophet” of 9.11 comes with his eschatological abilities of law interpretation to replace the Instructor and those prior priestly interpreters.

This Prophet motif is further supported by the external material from the HB. We have already noted how the priestly anointing tradition is drawn from the Pentateuch. As well known, 1QS makes several strong allusions to Deuteronomy. The opening of the liturgy (1.1–4) is a clear example drawing upon Deuteronomy’s “love the LORD with all your heart, soul, and strength”

³⁵ Leaney (*The Rule*, 118) waffles between people and books. Wernberg-Møller (*Manual*, 129) notes both Moses and the prophets give the Law, but they are not the interpreters.

³⁶ Pace Wernberg-Møller (*Manual*, 45) who interprets “prophets” as the prophetic books.

³⁷ Cross (*Ancient*, 161) sees teaching the Law as a priestly function.

³⁸ As a whole, much of 1QS appears to be a manual guide for the Maskil (Alexander and Vermes, *DJD* XXVI, 10).

(Deut 6:4–6). The two-ways tradition also recalls the blessings and curses of Deuteronomy (Deut 11:26–29; 27:11–26; 28:16–68; 9–15). Further, both 8.16 and 1.3 recall Deuteronomistic language when they refer to prophets and Moses. This pairing of Moses with the prophets creates the intertextual echo to Deut 18:15–19 which says,

¹⁵ The LORD your God will raise up for you a **prophet** (אִנְיָ) like me from among your own people; you shall heed such a prophet. ¹⁶ This is what you requested of the LORD your God at Horeb on the day of the assembly when you said: “If I hear the voice of the LORD my God any more, or ever again see this great fire, I will die.” ¹⁷ Then the LORD replied to me: “They are right in what they have said. ¹⁸ I will raise up for them a **prophet** (אִנְיָ) like you from among their own people; I will put my words in the mouth of the prophet, who shall speak to them everything that I command. ¹⁹ Anyone who does not heed the words that the prophet shall speak in my name, I myself will hold accountable (Deut 18:15–19).

Thus, 1QS 9.11 is recalling this “Prophet” who will come and give words of the law which must be obeyed.³⁹ Putting this together with the “anointed ones of Aaron and Israel,” we discover that 1QS 9.11 is speaking of a future hope where a Prophet (like Moses) will come *leading* the priests and laity from the Community, who have been “anointed” as part of their dedication to God’s service.⁴⁰ This appears to be the eschatological Community envisioned by 1QS which comes for the atonement of Israel.

6. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER SDQ

This paper has focused primarily upon 1QS for its interpretation of “anointed one” (משיח) in order to avoid the typical harmonization which scholars tend to do with SDQ material. In doing so, we have arrived at an interpretation which is very close to Brownlee’s initial interpretation of 1QS.⁴¹ Further, this interpretation is quite different than the interpretation of most scholars. Because most scholars begin their interpretation with cross-referencing 1QS with other SDQ documents, we will now briefly look at the SDQ presentation of “anointed ones” (משיח).⁴²

The Damascus Document (CD) is, of course, the scholarly favorite with five or six occurrences (2.12; 5.21; 12.23; 14.19 [recon.]; 19.10; 20.1). However, when looking at the SDQ, we do not find a uniform presentation of anointed figures. Rather, we find three anointed offices of prophet/teacher, priest, and king as found in the HB (which are not necessarily messianic).⁴³ In light of the majority view, it is quite surprising to see the lack of uniformity in the SDQ use of “anointed one” (משיח). If the Community were expecting one, two, or three Messiah’s and the

³⁹ Brownlee (*Dead Sea Manual*, 50) notes how this Prophet figure became interpreted messianically (e.g., 1Macc 4:46; T.Benj. 9:2; John 1:21, 25).

⁴⁰ Collins (*Scepter and Star*, 124–26) argues for an eschatological Teacher. *Pace* the Teacher (Wieder, “Law Interpreter,” 158–75) or as a forerunner (e.g., Cross, *Ancient*, 161; Vermes, *DSS*, 87) or one of three Messiahs

⁴¹ Brownlee, *Dead Sea Manual*, 34–35, 50 who sees the Prophet as the “Messiah” and the others as his followers who are priests and laity; as the Messiah, he can anoint his followers.

⁴² We will limit ourselves to texts which have not undergone reconstruction in order to limit speculation. We will also not look at other “messianic” terms or ideas, thus the exclusion of 1QSb.

⁴³ Because of his willingness to create a sketch of characteristics not necessarily bound by the use of “anointed one,” Collins (*Scepter and the Star*, 16–18), sees four types of “messiahs” (king, priest, prophet, heavenly messiah).

SDQ reflect these expectations, then we would expect a stronger and more distinct testimony from the documents (e.g., the NT).

6.1 MESSIANIC FIGURES

It is true that there are instances where “anointed one” clearly refers to some sort of eschatological messianic figure(s) who save(s) people. In CD, we see the “Messiah of Aaron and Israel” (19.10b–11a; 20.1)⁴⁴ who delivers people. CD also mentions the “Messiah of Aaron” (12.23).⁴⁵ 4Q252, 4Q381, and 4Q458 also seem to speak in terms of a Davidic messiah.⁴⁶ Both 4Q521 and 11Q13⁴⁷ could also refer to a kingly messiah.⁴⁸

As already noted above, 1QS does not have Davidic/kingly concerns, so it is difficult to see a sudden interest in a kingly messiah in 1QS 9.11.⁴⁹ Further, as also noted in the introduction, the closest parallels of CD 20.1 and 12.23 are really not that close, since CD deals with one figure versus a minimum of three as in 1QS.⁵⁰ CD is further problematized because there is a very good likelihood that it is a non-sectarian document appropriated by the Community (since it is also found outside Qumran).

In terms of development of ideas, one could argue that either 1QS qualified eschatological messianic expectations by identifying this figure as the Prophet (thus removing the kingly aspects) who would come with his anointed ones. Or one could argue that these documents that propose one messianic figure conflated the ideas of 1QS into one messianic figure. Really, the problem with developmental theories is their highly speculative nature. Thus, the strongest evidence for 1QS not being related to these messianic expectations comes from the absence of Davidic/kingly expectations in 1QS.

6.2 PROPHET/TEACHERS

⁴⁴ CD 19.10b–11a: “those who remain will be delivered up to the sword when there comes the messiah of Aaron and Israel (בבוא משיח אהרן וישראל)”

CD 20.1: {...} of the unique teacher until there arises the messiah out of Aaron and Israel (עד עמוד משיח מאהרן ומישראל).”

Also 14.19 if reconstructed “[until there arises the messiah] of Aaron and Israel.”

⁴⁵ CD 12.23 “Those who walk in them, in the time of wickedness until there arises the <messiah> (משוח) {משיח} of Aaron.

⁴⁶ 4Q252 5.3 ‘Until the messiah (עד בוא משיח) of righteousness comes, the branch of David....”

4Q381 frag 15, Line 7 quoting Ps 89:18 “and I, your anointed (דחישמ), have understood.”

4Q458 frag 2, 2.5b–6: “And he went on the mountains [...] 6 anointed (משיח) with the oil of the kingship of the...”

⁴⁷ 4Q521 frag2, 2.1: “[for the heav]ens and the earth will listen to his anointed one (למשיחו)...”

11Q13 2.18 quoting Dan 9:25: “And the messenger i[s] the anointed (משיח) of the spir[it] as Dan[iel] said.”

⁴⁸ E.g., VanderKam (“Messianism,” 212–19) surveys the Davidic-Messiah references in each scroll.

⁴⁹ While redaction theories can explain the insertion of 1QS 9.11, they fail to provide a *Sitz im Leben* since the other scrolls only mention a single messianic figure. Why do we not see other editor signs that makes these other messiah figures plural?

⁵⁰ Scholars will attempt harmonization by conflating 1QS’s messiahs into the one messiah of CD (e.g., Milik, *Ten Years*, 126).

However, “anointed one” also can refer to non-messianic figures who are prophets and teachers.

1QM 11.7–8 says, “By the hand of your anointed ones (משיחיה) seers of decrees, you taught us the ti[m]es of the wars of your hands.”

In addition, 4Q267 frag 2 ln. 5b–6a writes, “[And the] l[a]nd [became desolate], for they counseled a rebellion against God’s precepts (given) through the hand of [Mose]s and also of the holy anointed ones (במשיחי הקודש).”

Finally, CD 2.12 notes, “And he taught them by the hand of the anointed ones (משיחו {ed. משיחי}) with his holy spirit and through seers.”⁵¹

This idea of the “anointed ones” as non-messianic teachers harmonizes well with our above interpretation of “anointed ones” in 1QS.

Further, CD 5.21—6.1a parallels the concepts found in 1QS and our above interpretation.⁵² CD 5.21—6.1a says:

“And the land became desolate, for they spoke of rebellion against God’s precepts (given) through the hand of Moses and also of the holy anointed one{s} (במשיחו {edited as במשיח}).”

Speaking of both Moses the anointed ones as his successors of teaching is reminiscent of Deuteronomy’s schema of Moses and prophets after him. This idea of “anointed ones” following in the line of Moses is also seen in 4Q377⁵³ where Moses, the lawgiver is also the anointed one. This is possibly a similar schema found in 1QS where the “anointed” figures would be seen as the priests and Levites who help administer the Law to the Community in a line connected back to Moses.

CD’s references are especially significant, since CD is usually drawn upon for the Messiah connections to 1QS. These two CD (2.12; 5.21—6.1a) references show the variety of the term’s usages even in CD.

6.3 PRIESTS

We also discover the SDQ also uses “anointed one” to refer to priests.⁵⁴ Both 4Q375 and 4Q376 most clearly refer to the priests.⁵⁵ It is also most likely that 4Q270⁵⁶ also refers to priests, since it is in the context of referring to Aaron and his sons. Of the three anointed figures, these

⁵¹ See also, CD 5.21—6.1. Also possibly 6Q15 frag 3, ln 4: “Mose]s and al[so] of the holy anointed ones (במשיחי).”

⁵² Wernberg-Møller (*Manual*, 130) notes the parallel of 1QS 8.15 and CD 6.1 where the anointed ones are the prophets, but does not draw the same conclusions as myself.

⁵³ 4Q377 frag. 2, 2.5: “Cursed is the man who does not persevere and keep and carry [out] 5 all the la[ws] of Y]HWH by the mouth of Moses his anointed one (משיחו).”

⁵⁴ e.g., VanderKam (“Messianism,” 220–33) surveys eschatological priestly texts.

⁵⁵ 4Q375 frag. 1.7–9: “⁷...you shall come with that tribe and your elders and your judges ⁸ [t]o the place which your God will choose in one of your tribes before ⁹ [the] anointed priest upon whose head the oil of anointing has been poured (ה[ה] בְּוֹהֵן הַמְּשִׁיחַ אֲשֶׁר יוֹצֵק עָלָיו אֶשְׁוֹן הַמְּשִׁיחָה).”

4Q376 frag. 1 1.1: “of the anointed (חישמה) priest.”

anointed priests are the closest parallels with the “anointed ones” found in 1QS. They are similar because they are non-messianic figures and also involve groups rather than simply individuals.

6.4 1QSa

1QSa must be looked at on its own because it was physically attached to the scroll of 1QS. This attachment implies a close relationship of the texts. Further 1QS is clearly a composite document, so the connection of 1QS and 1QSa could be close. Despite this connection, it should still be remembered that 1QS was a distinct document in itself, and 1QSa was *added* to 1QS. Thus, the ideas of 1QSa are distinct from 1QS and represent a latter redactional layer. 1QSa refers to an “anointed one of Aaron.” It says,

¹¹At [a ses]sion of the men of renown, [those summoned to] the gathering of the community council, when [God] begets ¹²the **anointed one** with them: [the] chief [priest] of all the congregation of Israel shall enter and all ¹³[his] br[others, the sons] of Aaron, the priests [summoned] to the assembly the men of renown, and they shall sit ¹⁴be[fore him, each one] according to his dignity...After, [the Mess]iah of Israel shall [enter] and before him shall sit the heads of the ¹⁵th[ousands of Israel, each] one according to his dignity....^{20b}Afterwar[ds,] the **anointed one** of Israel [shall str]etch out his hands ²¹towards the bread....And in accordance with this precept one shall act ²²at each me[al, when] at least ten me[n are gat]hered.

Scholars tend to interpret this as an eschatological banquet where the messiah(s) dine(s) with the Community.⁵⁷ There appears to be two “anointed ones” a priestly leader (1.12–15) who is head over the priests (i.e., sons of Aaron) and the “anointed one” of Israel who is head of the Israelite laity (1.14–15).⁵⁸ These two figures appear to be leaders of these two groups.

Although “Anointed one of Israel” is *similar* to 1QS 9.11, there are two clear differences. First, “Anointed one of Aaron” is missing from 1QSa. It is from the *reconstructed* text, that scholars add the interpretation of the “anointed one” to be the priest.⁵⁹ Second, the Prophet is also missing from 1QSa and there is most likely only two figures mentioned in 1QSa. A third difference (based on our interpretation of 1QS 9.11) is that those who are the “anointed one” in 1QSa are individuals, while in 1QS they are groups. Because 1QSa is added to 1QS and there are differences in the figures, we cannot use 1QSa to interpret the original meaning of 1QS.

Thus, with 1QSa there does seem to be a development from 1QS where the Prophet has disappeared and now the “anointing” is focused upon the leaders of the two groups. These two figures are still priestly “anointed ones,” much like the high priest was a leader who was an “anointed one” in the HB. They are leaders, but not eschatological deliverers or Davidic kings.

With 1QSa we see a development in the concept of “anointed ones” and eschatological leaders. With 1QSa the eschatological leader is no longer the Prophet. Rather there is the chief “anointed one” of the Priestly anointed one in charge of the priests and the subservient “anointed one” in charge of the laity in the eschatological Community.

⁵⁶ 4Q270 frag. 2 2.13–14: “[...And whoever] ¹³ divulgest the secret of his people to the pagans, or curses [his people or preaches] ¹⁴ rebellion against those anointed with the spirit of holiness (על משיחי רוח הקדש) and error.”

⁵⁷ Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, 9.

⁵⁸ Milik, *Ten Years*, 124. VanderKam (“Messianism,” 221–24) disagrees with Milik’s reconstruction but eventually arrives at two messiahs.

⁵⁹ VanderKam, “Messianism,” 221–24.

7. CONCLUSION

Our investigation of 1QS 9.11 leads us to realize that the expected “anointed ones” are not Davidic messianic figures. Rather the “anointed ones of Aaron and Israel” reflect the two groups consistently found in the 1QS’s description of the Community’s twofold division of Aaron (i.e., priests) and Israel (i.e., the general session). These two groups of “anointed ones” are the priests who are called the “anointed ones of Aaron” and the general session who are called the “anointed of Israel.” Further, we interpreted the Prophet as an eschatological interpreter of the Law in line with the current Community’s instruction. Thus, we interpret 1QS 9.11 as referring to one eschatological leader, the Prophet who has two groups (priest and lay) of “anointed” followers representing the presence of the Community members as leaders over redeemed Israel in the eschaton.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, Philip S. and Geza Vermes. *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXVI: Qumran Cave 4 XIX Serekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Augustine. *On Christian Doctrine*. Trans. D.W. Robertson, Jr. In Library of Liberal Arts. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 1997.
- Brown, F. S. Driver, and C. Briggs, eds. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon: With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishing, 1996.
- Brownlee, William H. *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline: Translation and Notes*. In Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research Supplement Studies 10–12. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951.
- . “Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament.” In *NTS* 3/3 (May 1957): 195–210.
- Charlesworth, James H. et al. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Rule of the Community. Photographic Multi-Language Edition*. Philadelphia: American Interfaith Institute, 1996.
- Collins, John J. *Apocalypticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. NY: Routledge, 1997.
- . *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. 2d edition. New York: Doubleday, 2010.
- Cross, Frank M. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. 3rd edition. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph. *The One Who Is to Come*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- . *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Leaney, A. R. C. *The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. London: SCM Press, 1966.
- Metso, Sarianna. *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. Vol 21 in *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*. Edited by F. García Martínez and A.S. Van Der Woude. New York: Brill, 1997.
- Milik, J. T. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*. Trans. John Strugnell. In *Studies in Biblical Theology* 26. Naperville: SCM Press, 1959.

- Murphy-O'Connor, J. "The Community Rule," In AYBD. Ed. D.N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1996.
- Peuch, Émile. "Messianism, Resurrection, and Eschatology at Qumran and the New Testament." In *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Ed. Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.
- Priest, John F. "Mebaqqer, Paqid, and the Messiah." In *JBL* 81 (1962): 55–61.
- Schiffmann, Lawrence. *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. In Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 38. Ed. Adela Yarbro Collins. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- . "Messianic Figures and Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls." In *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity. The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1987. 116–129.
- VanderKam, James C. "Messianism in the Scrolls." In *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Ed. Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994. 211–234.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. New York: Penguin Press, 1998.
- Wernberg-Møller, P. *The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction*. In *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*. Vol 1. Ed. J. van der Ploeg. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957.
- Wieder, N. "The 'Law Interpreter' of the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Moses." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 4 (1953): 158–75,