

## Nathan's Promise to David in Qumran

Jong Chil Park\*

This promise is quoted in Qumran (4Q Flor), in Rabbinic Literature and in the New Testament. It is also alluded to many times in the Old Testament.

### I. The meaning of the Promise as found in the Old Testament.

#### A. In II Sam. 7:5-17.

The general tendency of critical scholars who comment on the promise of Nathan to David, is to show deuteronomistically redacted elements attributed to the Prophet Nathan and directed to David.<sup>1</sup> But God, who delivered Israel from Egypt, gave a sure and direct promise to David through Nathan at a turning point of progressive revelation. R. Kittel, who accepts a deuteronomic revision, admits the historical inviolability of this revelation:

"Es ist daher in der Tat kein Grund, die in der Überlieferung feststehende Absicht Davids, Jahve auf Zion einen Tempel zu bauen, und ihre Verhinderung durch profetenspruch als spätere Erfindung in Zweifel zu ziehen."<sup>2</sup>

This promise is a direct divine revelation.

Anyway, this promise occupies the most important place in God's Hellsgeschichte, as the critic von Rad does indicate.

\*Assistant Professor

<sup>1</sup>D. J. McCarthy, "II Samuel and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History," JBL, LXXXIV (1965), pp. 131-38. For the defense of orthodox view, cf. W. C. Kaiser, Jr.: "The Blessing of David," The Law and the Prophets, ed. J. H. Skilton (Nutley, N.J.: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1974), pp. 298-318. J. Schelhaas, II Samuel 7:1-5, *ibid*, pp. 283-87.

<sup>2</sup>Quoted from J. Schelhaas, *ibid*, p. 292.

"In it (Nathan's prophecy) also lies the historical origin and legitimation of much messianic expectations!"<sup>3</sup>

Then what did God promise to David? But unhappily many versions and commentators do not agree with the context of the prophecy. For example LXX and many other versions translate 'JWSY] in II Sam. 7:9b by a past tense *ἔποιησα* while Peshita used the future. And the verbs in II Sam. 7:9b-10a are translated by a future by ARV, NASB, NEB, S. R. Driver, etc., whereas it is translated as a past by Delitzsch and L. Rost, etc. KJV translates 'JWSY] (9b) and 'J]N'N'N] (11b) into past time, but these seem to be taken properly in a future sense. On this subject A. Gelston writes:

"Die vier perfekte mit waw consecutivum in II Sam. 7:9f lassen sich in ihrer natuerlicher Bedeutung als futurlisch verstehen, wenn man *QIPD* als 'Temple' anstatt als 'verheissenes Land interpretiert'."<sup>4</sup>

The first part of his sentence is right, but his replacement of "Temple" instead of "place" is improper because the theology of rest for David "is intimately associated with the land as an Israelite 'inheritance' (Deut. 12:9)."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup>Von Rad OTT, (1963), I. 311. But he holds "that the fact that Jahweh had led Israel out of Egypt was a part of Israel's confession at all times, but that he had guaranteed the continuance of the throne of David...was never taken up into the series of these confessional statements." (ibid., p. 366). W. C. Kaiser gives a good refutation of this view of God's promise:

1. I will make thee a great name (7:9b, cf. Gen. 12:2, etc.).
2. I will appoint a place for Israel and will plant them (7:10a; cf. Gen. 15:18; Deut. 11:24f; Josh. 1:4f).
3. I will set up thy seed after thee (7:12b; cf. Gen. 17:7; 8:9, 10, 19).
4. He shall be my son (7:14 cf. Ex. 4:22).
5. I will be to thee for a God and you shall be to me for a people (II Sam. 7:23, 24; cf. Gen. 17:7, 8; 28:21; Ex. 6:7; 29:45; Lev. 11:45; 22:18; 26:12, 44, 45; Num. 15:41; Deut. 4:20; 29:12, 13 etc.) op. cit. p. 309.

<sup>4</sup>"A Note on II Sam. 7:10", ZAW LXXXIV (1972), p. 74.

<sup>5</sup>Kaiser, ibid, p. 304.

Now let me state four propositions on Nathan's prophecy to David,<sup>6</sup> although we saw the context of the promise above.

(1) Descent of the King from the Seed of David. According to this promise Solomon fulfilled a part of this promise according to I Chronicles 22:10 and 28:6. He received an "immediate and partial fulfillment" but David's ultimate son is yet future in Jesus Christ.

(2) Sonship between Deity and King. I will be his father and he shall be my (God's) son". (7:14a)

(3) Promise of eternal reign on the throne of the Kingdom of Israel. In this aspect the immediately following king, Solomon, could not achieve the ideal kingship of this prophecy. The Davidic promise was eternal, but this aspect can be fulfilled on the basis of loyalty and fidelity. In this sense, the ideal King can be connected with the suffering Servant in Isaiah.

(4) Closer relationship between Dynasty (Kingship) and the Temple (Priesthood). The nuance of *J]N* (in vv. 11 and 13) is different. The former means the dynasty and the latter means the temple. But they are harmonious. As F. Willeson's study reflects, the building of a temple played an important role in connection with establishing a kingdom in the ancient Near East. The point is:

"Before a temple could be built, the house of David had to be established by Yahweh; in other words: the initiative and first steps in building a temple to crown the completion of the creation of a kingdom were to be taken by Yahweh himself."<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup>I am indebted for some ideas contained here to Dennis C. Deling, "The Promises to David and their Entrance into Christianity-Nailing Down a Likely Hypothesis," NTS, XIX, (1973), pp. 55-77. But the content is different.

<sup>7</sup>F. Willeson, "The Cultic Situation of Ps. 74", VT, II (1952), pp. 289-90.

F. F. Bruce finds a closer relationship between kingship and priesthood in the phrase: David "sat before the Lord" (II Sam. 7:18) and connects this fact with the sitting down at the right hand of God of "Great David's greater Son."<sup>8</sup> This promise of God becomes "the charter for Humanity"<sup>9</sup> permanently (cf. II Sam. 22:51). Therefore, David, in his last word, rhetorically, refers to an "everlasting covenant". (II Sam. 23:5).

B. In Ps. 89:3-4, 19, 37.

The historical and revelational event of the Davidic Dynasty in II Samuel also becomes the source of Ps. 89. The eternal human character of the Davidic Dynasty is here guaranteed with God's own oath (v. 3).

Of course, here we cannot find the content of the promise in II Sam. 7:9b-10a and the word "house" of Samuel. But the subjects of this Psalm are David's "seed" (v. 4), "his throne" (29), "the eternal duration of the dynasty" (36), and the relation of sonship between Deity and King (26).

Here we must give attention to one fact: The "seed" is the highest of all Kings.

"And I will make him my first-born the highest of the kings of the earth. My steadfast love I will keep for him forever and my covenant will stand firm for him" (27-28).

The Book of Revelation quotes this verse (1:5). The royal power of the highest of the kings includes the sea and the rivers (Ps. 89:25).

<sup>8</sup>F. F. Bruce, BEQT, p. 75.

<sup>9</sup>See Kaiser's excellent study וְזֵאת תְּוֹרַת הַגְּדֹלָה in II Sam. 7:19b, op. cit., p. 310.

C. Ps. 132:11-18.

In this Psalm, the Davidic royal covenant (vv. 11-12) is connected with God's choosing a physical locality, i.e., Jerusalem. This place is God's resting place forever (13, 14). Here, too, the theology of rest is found in a place: "There (Zion) I will make a horn to sprout for David; I have prepared a lamp for my anointed." (v. 17). This verse echoes I Kgs. 11:36:

"But for his (David's) son I will give one tribe in order that there will continue a lamp for David my servant all the day before me in Jerusalem, the city in which I have chosen to put my name."

These verses Ezekiel employed in his prophecy:

"On that day I will cause a horn to sprout to the house of Israel and I will open your lips among them" (Ezek. 29:21).

Certainly by this promise the dynasty of David is clothed with strength, power and light. By rule of the mighty One of David's line all creation is blessed. In this sense, Psalm 72 also echoes the Davidic promise of Samuel.

D. In Isa. 55:3-5.

The phrase "sure mercies of David" (וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂמְחוּ) reflects the historical promise to David in II Sam. 7. We can find the same terms in II Sam: וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂמְחוּ (v. 15) and וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂמְחוּ (v. 16).

Isaiah had a futuristic hope in "him" (Isa. 54:4). Some take "him" to be Israel or the historical David but, when we see "behold" referring to the future, this "him" is the seed of David promised to David. In view of his mission, Isaiah called him "witness", "prince", and "commander". This "prince" can be compared to Dan. 9:25. According to these designations, he is the conqueror over all nations and at the same time the one to reconcile them to Himself (Isa. 55:5).

In this sense, Isa. 55:3-5 seems to have much influence on the author of 11 Q Melch, although the latter does not quote these verses directly.

Besides these passages, the promise to David was surely effective throughout the whole history of Israel in the Old Testament. Of course, because of the sin of Israel this promise had often become dim. But God's promise had continued to be firm permanently. One time to an Israelite who feared that the promises of God had been proved ineffective, God's reply was:

"If you can break my covenant with the day, and my covenant with the night, so that day and night will not come at their appointed time, then also my covenant with David my servant may be broken, so that he shall not have a son to reign on this throne" (Jer. 33:20f, cf Ps. 89:28-35).

This is just the Charter of Humanity.

It is, of course, of interest to note that this mention of the Davidic covenant of Isaiah 55:3 comes in the song of praise following the redemption accomplished by the suffering Servant who becomes a sin offering in Isa. 53:10. Here the seed of David promise is joined to Israel's sacrificial ceremonial system and to the great Servant passage.

## II. Nathan's promise to David in Qumran.

The sure promise to David was also understood by the Qumran people. But as we shall study it, their interpretation is not always the same as it is in the New Testament. Its application is different to some extent, but the futuristic element of the Davidic Shoot is the same as in the Old Testament.

The so-called 4Q Florilegium, based on the exposition of some

various Biblical texts contains the prophecy to the house of David.<sup>10</sup> This fragment certainly shows the theological understanding of the Qumran sect for God's promise to David in II Sam. 7 with many quotations or allusions from Biblical verses and with a pesher giving the sect's interpretations of those passages. The quoted Biblical verses in Col. 1 are: II Sam. 7:10b-11a; Ex. 15:17-18; II Sam. 7:16; II Sam. 7:11c-14a; Amos 9:11; Ps. 1:1; Isa. 8:11; Ezek. 37:23;<sup>11</sup> Ps. 2:1. A. M. Allegro, in his new published text, gives more quoted verses in Col 2: Dan. 12:10, 11:32 and Deut. 33:8-11, 33:12, 33:18-21.<sup>12</sup> Among many cited verses, the main comment is made on II Sam. 7, while other verses are introduced to illustrate the development of midrashic comments about II Sam. 7. The cited Samuel passages are: 10b-11a.... 11b....11c-14a. It becomes apparent that there are no omitted verses between citations, but some verses are omitted inside citations. This might show the theological viewpoint of the Qumran sect -- to adopt certain verses to its eschatological situation. It will clarify the picture if we tabulate the verses:

<sup>10</sup>J. M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran", JBL, LXXV (1956), pp. 176-77. Here only 4 lines appear. K. Schubert, "Die Messiaslehre in den Texten von Chirbet Qumran", *Biblische Zeitschrift*, I, (1959) pp. 177-97. Allegro, "Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrashim", JBL, LXXVII, (1958), pp. 350-54. Y. Yadin, "A Midrash on II Sam. vii and Ps. i-ii (4Q Florilegium)" IEJ, IX (1959), pp. 85-88. Allegro: DJD, V (1968), pp. 53-57.

<sup>11</sup>Following Yadin's Reading, *ibid.* But Allegro, in his later published text, accepts Yadin's reading instead of Ezk. 44:10 as he first read the latter. DJD, V, p. 55.

<sup>12</sup>DJD, V, pp. 55-57.

M.T.	4Q Flor.
11b And the Lord declares to you that the Lord יְהוָה will make a house בַּיִת יַעֲשֶׂה for you.	10a And the Lord declares to you that he will build a house בַּיִת יִבְנֶה for you.
12a When your days are fulfilled and you lie down with your father.	----- -----
12b And I will raise up your seed after you.	10b I will raise up your seed after you.
12b Who will come forth from your body	----- -----
12c And I will establish his kingdom	10c And I will establish
13a he shall build a house for my name and I will establish אֶבְנֶה	----- ----- -----
13b the throne of his kingdom forever.	10c the throne of his kingdom forever.
14 I will be to him a father and he will be to me a son	11 I will be to him a father and he will be to me a son.

From the presentation above, the accidental omission of some material by an error or a variant MS tradition or a short quotation might all be possible. When we examine the omitted verses: 12a is about the Davidic life, 12b about one of David's immediate posterity. The latter is confirmed by the use of the phrase "your son" in the parallel verse of Chronicles. And 12c and 13 might be at least thought to be referred by the author of the fragment to the earthly Temple and Kingdoms. Therefore, it appears that the omission is purposive.

Besides this, the "sons of wickedness" in MT are replaced with "son of wickedness" in 4Q Flor. (cf. I Chr. 17:9 and Ps. 29:22). But this difference seems not to be great because the wicked could be

singular (as the epitome and representative of the opposition to God's seed) or plural, i.e., all opponents. However, in most cases of the Qumran material, the singular represents the concept of corporate solidarity. Even in these fragments, beside the son of wickedness, there are other instances: "His" life (1.9),<sup>13</sup> "his anointed" (1.19),<sup>14</sup> "the elect of Israel" (1.19).

Above all, the commentary structure of 4Q Florilegium shows strongly the author's theological conception:

- (1) A quotation from II Sam. 7:10b with exposition אֶלֶּךָ and אֶשְׂרֵךְ about the temple, i.e., a Qumran spiritual temple (11.1-9).
- (2) A quotation from II Sam. 7:11c-14a with exposition אֶלֶּךָ and אֶשְׂרֵךְ about the realized and also future dynasty (11.10-13).
- (3) A quotation from Ps. 1:1 and 2:1 with אֶשְׂרֵךְ and אֶשְׂרֵךְ about the subsequent effect (i.e., peace) of the messianic age.

The formal evidence for this division is:

We observe that there are two spaces at the end of 1.9<sup>15</sup> and also of 1.13. The evidence is convincing: The "house" in 11.1-9 is expressed with אֶבְנֶה (11.2,3) and also connected with "sanctuary" (1.4) "the sanctuary of Israel", (1.6), and "the sanctuary of man", (1.6),<sup>1</sup>

<sup>13</sup>See Note 18 of Allegro, JBL, LXXVII, (1958) p. 352.

<sup>14</sup>"His anointed" should be "they", 1.2 of Col. 2. Therefore, it can not be a messianic reference.

<sup>15</sup>Lane admits two spaces but worries about the first space, "It is disconcerting to note that the end of 1.9 is also left blank for no apparent reason". He only tries to find the reason from consideration of external form. W. R. Lane, "A New Commentary Structure of 4Q Florilegium", JBL, LXXVIII (1959), p. 344, n. 5.

<sup>16</sup>A better translation is "consisting of man".

while in 11.10-12  $\text{ג'ב}$  without the article is expressed and connected with "the Shoot of David," (1.12) and "The Tabernacle of David," (1.12). In my opinion,  $\text{ג'ב}$  designating the dynasty, is shadowed by the authority of  $\text{ג'בג}$  which designates the temple. All these phenomena show their strong theological opinions on Biblical study revealed by their treatment of citations.

In passing, we want to mention that the text of this fragment closely follows the MT of Samuel (not the LXX) instead of the Chronicles edition of the same oracle. We know that the many fragments from Cave 4 have revealed Hebrew texts of various Biblical books that support the readings of the LXX against those of MT.<sup>17</sup> And the Qumran caves have unveiled many other fragments following the Samaritan and Massoretic types of text.<sup>18</sup>

### III. The Meaning of "Seed" in 4Q Florilegium.

In order to understand the interpretation of the word "seed" in the promise to David in Qumran, it is necessary to examine the other uses of agricultural terms in the Qumran Texts. However, this attempt does not always promise to get the unique meanings in the Qumran texts because we may not make mathematical equations in apocalyptic literatures. This means we have some tension between strict literalness and reasonable freedom.

The word "seed" is found in a verse quoted from Samuel's prophecy studied above. If so, does the Qumran author employ this word with the same meaning as in Nathan's prediction? The Biblical meaning

<sup>17</sup>F. M. Cross, IFJ 16, (1966), pp. 81-85, etc.

<sup>18</sup>R. L. Harris: "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the O.T. Text" in *New Perspective on the OT*, ed. Payne, pp. 201-11.

seems to be that although the "seed" may have, in some sense, an immediate and partial fulfillment in Solomon the King, the ultimate fulfillment is to be found in Jesus Christ, David's seed (Rom. 1:3, II Tim. 2:8, Heb. 1:5, etc.). At first glance, the "seed" in 4Q Flor. seems to point to one futuristic figure because we find not only that the Qumran document utilizes the futuristic verses, omitting the verses seemingly related to the historic situation of David, Solomon, etc., but also it inserts in appropriate places reference to the "shoot of David who will arise" in the future. But on further consideration, the opinion of this writer is that 4Q Flor. seems to employ this word "seed" (and "son") to apply to the contemporary situation, not to a future period. If this is so, we can find a link between their concepts of temple and dynasty. They always had a consciousness of having in their group corporately the true temple and the true dynasty. But their concept of this "seed" as contemporary, of course, helps to illuminate their hope for the coming Shoot of David, only they think they are the true remnant of the "seed", and, therefore, a future "seed" may come out of their posterity. Therefore we hold, the "seed" and the "shoot of David" in 4Q Flor. are not the same.<sup>19</sup> The latter is certainly a future figure whom we will discuss more later.

At present in the published Qumran Texts, there are only a few additional instances of the use of the word "seed".<sup>20</sup> One case refers literally to "sowing" (1QS 10:11). The other cases all give the concept of posterity, progeny (1QM 10:11). The other cases all give the

<sup>19</sup>B. Gaertner thinks both are the same representing the Qumran Community, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and in the New Testament*, (Cambridge: University Press, 1965), pp. 37, 132.

<sup>20</sup>TWNT, "Sperma" in. loc.

concept of posterity, progeny (1QM 13:7; 17:18; CDC 2:12) or its fruits (1QS 4:7) etc. But with only this information we cannot say that the "seed" in 4Q Flor. also refers to the same category as the others above, because in these other places we do not find cases of the "seed" appearing in relation to the Davidic dynasty as in 4Q Flor. So we must try to find the meaning just from the context of this fragment (4Q Flor.).

As presented earlier, the section in which this word "seed" appears, refers to a part of the Qumran family. We take the meaning of "ecclesiastical temple"<sup>21</sup> in 1. 1-9. The pesher in 1.7, interprets "thee" as "them" (the community of the people). It also seems to be proper to take "your seed (and son)" in 1.10 as the family or dynasty meaning the community. Because the Qumran people were conscious that they were a royal-priesthood and a priestly kingdom, the concept of priesthood and kingdom in Qumran is concentrated in the Qumran Community. But we do not think the consciousness of their calling was perfectly consummated in their time. They also had a future hope, probably owing to the realization of their imperfection with which we will deal later. We can find this idea in 1QS 8:5-7, too:<sup>22</sup>

"An eternal planting, a holy house for Israel, a most holy foundation for Aaron: true witnesses in judgement, the elect ones of God's favor, to make propitiation for the land and to requite the wicked with their recompense."  
(also cf. 1QS 11:8.)

In short, we must find the meaning of "seed" from the whole context. 4Q Flor. develops one of the fundamental themes in Qumran: the temple and the dynasty, which have been defiled by the wicked priests

<sup>21</sup>The usage of Gaertner.

<sup>22</sup>Generally 1QS is accepted to be earlier than 4Q Flor.

and people, have been replaced by the new temple and kingdom with emphasis on holiness (1.3), purity (11.3-5), and eternal qualities (11.4-5).<sup>23</sup> The concept of the "Seed" as a holy people and a holy temple and kingdom gave the people of Qumran the responsibility for fulfilling these qualities. Only in their adhering to this concept of "seed" is there the future hope that all the law of God might be fulfilled.

Also in pseudepigraphical literatures, we have some cases in which the word "seed" refers corporately to the people of Israel. She is a "chosen seed" which "is shown" by God (Enoch 62:8) and "a plant of the seed forever" (Enoch 84:6). Enoch also represents Israel's people as "the plant of uprightness" (93:2), "the plant of righteousness" (93:5), the "eternal plant of righteousness" (93:80), and "the plant of righteous judgment" (93:5).

#### IV. The Meaning of the Phrase "Shoot of David" in 4Q Flor. and Other Literatures.

This writer asserted above that the phrase "Shoot of David" does not refer to the same figure as the term "seed". This "Shoot of David" is the salvific figure of the hope of the Qumran Community in the Davidic line. Even in one short passage the events of past, present and future are put together. This is a characteristic of Jewish literatures, perhaps owing to the fact that the Jewish people thought all events in history in past, present and future were caused by the same God. Therefore, all the facts are intimately related to the providence of the same God. K. Weiss has claimed that among the Jews the present and the past are mirrored in the future.

<sup>23</sup>See Gaertner, op. cit., p. 30ff.

"Als das wird mehr oder weniger in das Bild der messianischen Zeit hineingespiegelt, so dass heils-geschichtliche Vergangenheit des Volkes, Heilsgegenwart der Sekte und messianische Zukunft ganz ineinander liegen und auf einer Ebene gesehen werden. So erklart sich wohl auch die Tatsache, dass ueber Gestalten der Vergangenheit und Gegenwart einerseits und ueber erwartete messianische Personen andererseits gleichartige, in identische Aussagen gemacht werden konnen."<sup>24</sup>

Except for the phrase "the Shoot of David" (4Q Flor., 4 QPB, 4Qp Isa. a), there are very rare appearances of this word  $\text{נֹס}$  in the Qumran Texts. We find only the verbal form in CDC 1:7:

"And He (God) caused to sprout forth ( $\text{נֹס}$ ) from Israel and Aaron, a root of cultivation."

This means that the Qumran Community was formed as a root by God's visitation. Except for this instance, the writer could not find another use of the word  $\text{נֹס}$  but the Qumran literature also uses other vegetable terms for the corporate body or even, seemingly, for individual persons of the Qumran Community as, for example, "the flower of the field" (1QH 6:15, cf. Isa. 28:1), "an eternal planting" (1QS 8:7, 1QS 11:8, etc.). The word "shoot"  $\text{נֹס}$  is found in 1QH 6:15; 7:19; 8:6, 8, 10; 4Qp Isa<sup>a</sup> 1.10.

Here it is important to study the meaning of  $\text{נֹס}$  in 1QH 8:10<sup>25</sup> because many scholars debate it. First let us quote the passages:

"I give thanks unto thee, O Lord,  
because, in a dry place, thou hast set me beside a fountain;  
in an arid land, beside a spring;  
in a desert, beside an oasis;  
like one of those ever green trees -  
fir or pine or cypress -

<sup>24</sup>K. Weiss, "Messianismus in Qumran und im Neuen Testament", quoted in *Studies on the Jewish Background of the New Testament*, preface H. Van Praag, (Assen, Holland: Van Gorcum, 1969), pp. 53, 54.

<sup>25</sup>ed. M. Wallenstein: *Nezer and Submission in Suffering, Hymns from the Dead Sea Scrolls*. This book was not available for the writer.

planted together to Thy glory,  
which, hidden 'mid other trees -  
trees that stand beside water -  
are fed from a secret spring,  
and which put forth blossom unfolding  
upon an eternal trunk,  
striking firm root ere they burgeon,  
spreading their roots to the stream;  
a tree whose stem is exposed to living waters,  
and whose stock lies beside a perpetual fount.  
A tree on whose flowering leaves  
all the beasts of the woodland can feed;  
whose roots are so widespread  
that all wayfarers cannot but tread them;  
upon whose dangling boughs  
there is room for every bird  
"All those other trees -  
these trees that stand beside water -  
keep railing against it,  
because they grow entangled in their plantations  
and cannot send out their roots to the stream,  
while this one,  
which put forth the shoot of Holiness upon  
the stock of truth,  
keeps its secret hidden, unknown,  
sealed and unsuspected."<sup>26</sup>

Here we find the phrases "trees of life", (1.6) "trees by the water" (1.6) and "shoot" (1.10). Here Dupont-Sommer claims that the fountain which flows in the arid land is the Teacher of Righeousness himself. So he translated  $\text{נֹס}$  in  $\text{נֹס}$  (1.4) by "as". Therefore, he translated as follows: "thou hast set me as (not beside) the fountain."<sup>27</sup> And he saw that the expression concerning the suffering of the  $\text{נֹס}$  in 1.8 is the humiliation of the teacher. He declares that the Teacher himself in 1QH 8:10-15 is the Servant of the Lord in Isaiah's Servant Songs.

Certainly the  $\text{נֹס}$  is the main point of this Hymn in this section. The tree of life makes it to sprout forth, so that it will be

<sup>26</sup>1QH 8:4-10 from Gaster, op. cit., p. 167.

<sup>27</sup>Also J. Carmignac, op. cit., p. 148.

an eternal plantation (1.6). And the  $\gamma\zeta\eta$  is fed by the water of life and is beside the fountain of eternity (1.7f). It is the Shoot of Holiness (  $\omega\tau[\eta]\rho \gamma\zeta\eta$  ) which will grow from small beginnings to the true plant (1.10). But its existence is sealed and its secrets will be unknown to the world. God himself protects it through angels (1.11). As F. Noetscher comments, this seems to point to an "eschatologischen Zukunft".<sup>28</sup>

Then what (or who) is  $\gamma\zeta\eta$  in this hymn? G. Jeremias, who attributed to the Teacher of Righteousness only the following hymns in QH: 2:1-19; 2:31-39; 3:1-18; 4:5-5:4; 5:5-19; 5:20-7:5; 7:6-25; 8:4-40;<sup>29</sup> judges that the historical Teacher of Righteousness cannot be the  $\gamma\zeta\eta$  here because the personal pronoun used in the prayer is changed to  $\gamma\lambda\eta$  in 1.14. Thus, he is against the opinion of Dupont-Sommer.<sup>30</sup>

However,  $\gamma\zeta\eta$  seems to bear supernatural imagery, but it is difficult to show that it goes beyond the life of the community. Mansoor, the translator of the Thanksgiving Hymns, gives the following comment:

These things are mysterious, because they have surpassed the natural, they are therefore supernatural. Nevertheless, everything seems to be somehow interpreted in relation to the existence and life of the community, which is also elsewhere designated as a plantation with an eschatological future. (1QH 6:15; 8:6; Isa. 61:3; Mk. 15:13)<sup>31</sup>

<sup>28</sup>F. Noetscher: Von Alten Zum Neuen Testament, (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1962), p. 143.

<sup>29</sup>G. Jeremias: Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit, (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1963), pp. 168-264.

<sup>30</sup>Jeremias' wording is "bis zu dem  $\gamma\lambda\eta$  in z.14 Mitte von dem Lehrer in den Vorangehenden Zeilen nicht die Rede ist," p. 260.

<sup>31</sup>Mansoor: The Thanksgiving Hymn, p. 154, no. 4.

Therefore, it is hard to find an individual and futuristic meaning in the agricultural terms except only the "Shoot of David" in the Qumran Texts. Certainly the latter term shows a hope for a future King in the Davidic line. Of course, it is not clear whether the "Shoot of David" in 4Q Flor. refers to the Messiah of David or not, but in another source, especially in 4QPB, this phrase clearly points to the Davidic Messiah. J. Liver brings together these three common passages which have the "Shoot of David" term in common (4Q Flor; 4QPB; and 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup>).<sup>32</sup> His points are:

- (1) All the texts where "Shoot of David" appears were found in Qumran Cave 4.
- (2) All the texts show a statement of hope for a Messiah of David, these hopes being based on scriptural passages.
- (3) All the passages use the term "Shoot of David" together with the title "Expounder of the Law".

In only two of the sources does the phrase "Expounder of the Law" actually appear, but the reconstruction in the third seems convincing.

Besides the Dead Sea Scrolls, the title "Shoot of David" can be found in several almost contemporary literatures, e.g., the Hebrew Text of Ecclus. 51:12-13 from the Cairo Geniza reads as follows:

Give thanks to him who buildeth His city and His sanctuary;

For His mercy endureth for ever.

<sup>32</sup>J. Liver, "The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs in Sectarian Literature in the Time of the Second Commonwealth" in HTR, pp. 158f.

Give thanks unto him that makes a horn to shoot up  
 for the house of David,  
 For His mercy endureth forever  
 Give thanks to him who chooses the sons of Zadok to  
 act as priests,  
 For His mercy endureth forever.<sup>33</sup>

In the book of the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" we can find the term "Shoot of David" representing a future hope. But among scholars there is much disagreement about the date of these texts (Christian? or Jewish with Christian editing?) and about the view of the future Messiah in these books. On our subject the "Shoot of David", I shall pick up only one representative text from this literature:

- (1) And after these things shall a star arise to you from Jacob in peace and a man shall arise from my seed like a sun of righteousness walking with the sons of men in meekness and righteousness and no sin shall be found in him.
- (2) And the heavens shall be opened unto him to pour out the spirit, even the blessing of the Holy Father and he shall pour out the spirit of grace upon you.
- (3) And you shall be unto him sons in truth, and you shall walk in his commandments first and last.
- (4) This branch of God most high and this fountain is giving life unto all.
- (5) Then shall the scepter of my kingdom shine forth, and from your root shall arise a stem.
- (6) And from it shall grow a rod of righteousness to the nations, to judge and to save all that call upon the Lord.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>33</sup>J. Liver, "The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs in Sectarian Literature in the Time of the Second Commonwealth" in HTR, pp. 158f.

<sup>34</sup>Test. of Judah 24:1-6. Those who assert a Jewish origin see the Messiah from Levi in vs. 1-3 and the Messiah from Judah in vs. 4-6. Therefore, they think "from my seed" representing the Davidic seed is from post-Christian interpolations. (Charles, van der Woude, Liver, Kuhn, etc.) Those who see the text as post-Christian, give attention to the words "pour out the spirit of grace" as an allusion to Christian baptism. The latter are de Jonge, A.J.B. Higgins, etc. For the view of the Messiah in the Twelve Patriarchs, see A.J.B. Higgins, "The Priestly Messiah" NTS 13 (1969) p. 211-239. Also, J. Liver, op. cit., pp. 163-79.

Here the word for the "Branch" is βλαστος<sup>35</sup> which is different from the LXX usage ἀνατολή representing the "shoot". But K. Schubert retranslated the Greek βλαστος into the Hebrew קָשֶׁט שֶׁל מִשְׁכַּן הַקֹּדֶשׁ.<sup>36</sup> In any case, it points to the coming One, the Messiah from the line of David.

In later Judaism, too, the shoot of David means the Messiah. Strack-Billerbeck gives these examples:<sup>37</sup>

Targum Isaiah 11:1: And there shall come forth a King from the Sons of Jesse, and the Messiah shall be raised up from the sons of his sons.

Targum Jeremiah 23:5: Behold the day will come the Lord says: I will make David arise, the Messiah of Righteousness.

They give also references to Talmudic literature.

Our belief that this Shoot of David refers to the coming Davidic Messiah is further strengthened by the fact that our text relates this figure to the passage about the Davidic Dynasty: "And I shall raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen" (Amos 9:11). And the midrash in this place continues to exegete it: That is the tabernacle of David that is fallen and which will arise to save Israel". L. H. Silbermann, in his "A Note on 4Q Florilegium", proposed to read the midrashic "tabernacle" as "branch" קָשֶׁט and to link it up with the Shoot of David.

Putting aside his suggestion, whether true or not, it is clearly right that this Amos passage points to the Davidic Dynasty in the original biblical meaning. And also in these Qumran texts we can find a royal element in the interpretation of this passage (cf CDC 7:14f, and 11:8).

<sup>35</sup>cf. ἐκ βλαστοῦ, οὐκ ἐμὸν ἀνεβησ in LXX Gen. 49:9. This is Messianic.

<sup>36</sup>J. Liver, Ibid., p. 174, n. 82.

<sup>37</sup>SB, I, 935.

Without doubt this problem of the relation of the Expounder of the Law to other figures is quite complicated and concerns the background of the Qumran Community and the nature of the Messiah in Qumran. Who was the Teacher of Righteousness? and what is his relationship to the Shoot of David, and to the "Messiah of Aaron and Israel"?

These questions are difficult to solve. The reason this is true is, as Bruce put it, "because of the allusiveness of the Qumran references to the Teacher and the uncertainty of any reconstruction of his career."<sup>38</sup> Another reason is the difference of the interpretation of many scholars-- in a number of instances, more than of the texts themselves.

As suggested so far, the Teacher of Righteousness has been identified with several historical persons: The identification can be different depending on the identity and date of the Qumran sect according to the various theories of the scholars. J. A. Sanders gives nine candidates: "Onias III, murdered in 171 B.C. at Daphne, Jose ben Joezer, probably second century B.C.; Ebenezer the Pharisee in the time of John Hyrcanus; Judas the Essene in the time of Aristobulus I; Onias the just, stoned in 62 B.C.; Jesus of Nazareth, Menahem ben Jehudah, executed in A.D.66; Abu 'Isa of the Seventh century; and Menahem ben Saruq, also of the seventh century."<sup>39</sup> Besides these, Nehemiah or Ezra in the Bible have been identified with the Teacher.

Gaster thinks "that the Teacher of Righteousness denotes a continuing office rather than a particular individual, and that the

<sup>38</sup>F. F. Bruce: "Jesus and the Gospels in the Light of the Scrolls" in The Scrolls and Christianity, p. 80.

<sup>39</sup>A. S. Sanders, "The Dead Sea Scrolls - A Quarter Century of Study," BA XXXVI (1973), p. 130.

various allusions to him are not in fact to one and the same person."<sup>40</sup>

The question about the Teacher of Righteousness does not cease here for the question about the historical Teacher is connected with the future hope (future Teacher of Righteousness) of the Qumran People, because the Qumran people expressed their expectation as to their Teacher. Some take this expectation to mean that the original Teacher will be resurrected. Then the views are split here into two main groups. One group includes those, who, in any form, want to attribute Messianic functions to the resurrected Teacher. The other group are those who think the Teacher will come again and will arise but do not want to think him to be the Messiah or one of the Messiahs.<sup>41</sup> This writer does not want to deal with the problem of the Teacher further because many have already dealt with it, but only to deal with his relationship to our texts. The problem of the Teacher is a hypothetical matter.

Our text of 4Q Flor. reads: "The shoot of David who will arise with the Expounder of the Law ( דורש התורה )". Then what is the identification of the Expounder of the Law?

First, we must examine some passages in which the Expounder or Expounder of the Law appears:

<sup>40</sup>GDSS, p. 30.

<sup>41</sup>Schechter, Dupont-Sommer, Allegro, Stauffer, Stendahl, Fritsch, Higgins, Brownlee, Cross, etc., belong to the first group and Rabin, Schubert, Bruce, Milik, Ginzberg, Staerk, Black, Vermes, Van der Woude, Vaux, Brown, Rowley, Burrows, etc., belong to the latter group. For their views, see G. Jeremias, op. cit., pp. 285-80.

(1) In CDC 6:2-11

God remembered His covenant with the forefathers, and He raised up from Aaron men of understanding and from Israel men of wisdom, and He made them hear Him, and they dug the well (באר) the well which the princes (שרים) dug, which the nobles of the people (בגחוקק) delved with the staff (בגחוקק).

The "well" is the Law, the diggers are those Israelites who repented and went out of the land of Judah and sojourned in the land of Damascus, all of whom God called princes (שרים) because they sought Him, and their glory was never revoked by anyone's authority. The "staff" is the Expounder of the Law (חטוקק הוא דורש התורה) as Isaiah said: "who produces an instrument for its purpose" (Isa. 54:16). The "Nobles of the people" (בגחוקק) are those who have come to dig the well with the staves which the "staff" established to walk with during the whole epoch of wickedness, and apart from these they will not attain their goal until the Teacher of Righteousness stands up in the latter days (עד עמד יורה).<sup>42</sup>

From this quotation, we can find two equations: (1) the well (באר) = the Law (התורה) and; (2) the Staff (הגחוקק) = the Expounder of the Law (דורש התורה). Although we don't know who the Expounder of the Law is, he is the lawgiver for the community and is evidently distinguished from the Teacher of Righteousness (יורה הצדק) who will rise in the latter days. If we suppose he is the historical Teacher of Righteousness who founded the Community, will he come to the world again as a risen Teacher of Righteousness?<sup>43</sup> But here we are not sure what relationship the Expounder of the Law has to the Teacher.

Here we can at least say that the historical Teacher cannot be the Teacher of Righteousness in CDC 6:11 for several definite reasons:

<sup>42</sup>Following Bruce's reading, BEQT, p. 37.

<sup>43</sup>Dupont-Sommer, and many scholars, say: The Expectation of second coming of the Teacher of Righteousness is one of the fundamental articles in the creeds of the people of the New Covenant."

(1) If we take CDC 6:11 to teach the return of the Teacher, this cannot harmonize with CDC 19:35-20:1: "from the day when there was gathered<sup>44</sup> the Teacher of the Community<sup>45</sup> until Messiah from Aaron and from Israel shall arise". Here there are two clear facts: one is the Teacher was dead. CDC 20:14 clarifies this further. The other fact is the Messiah from Aaron and Israel must be plural. We do not find any hint of the Teacher's resurrection here.<sup>46</sup>

(2) The character of the language in 6:11 prohibits the identification of the Teacher of Righteousness in CDC 6:11 with the historical Teacher. The main purpose in this section concerns the law which the community must keep. While the community is wandering in this wicked period until the latest (maybe the last) lawgiver<sup>47</sup> will come, the community must keep the Law.

As Schechter put it properly, "Any new things not included in (6:10) as dictated by the Lawgiver shall not be reached before the end of the days."<sup>48</sup>

<sup>44</sup>יָבֵן means "natural and peaceful death" cf. Gen. 25:8, 7; 35:29, etc. R. E. Brown, *Scrolls and Christianity*, ed. M. Black (London: S. P. C. K., 1969), p. 100; Rowley BJRL, XLIV, (1961), p. 127.

<sup>45</sup>Or the unique teacher.

<sup>46</sup>Dupont-Sommer: Identified the "Messiah from Aaron and from Israel" with the Teacher of Righteousness and asserted that these plural terms arise only "from the most elementary rhetoric". Carmignac, op. cit., p. 24.

<sup>47</sup>יורה הצדק is here related to the יורה הצדק (Rabin); rather it should be related to עמד (Van de Woude). This writer agrees with the view of Dr. R. L. Harris on the meaning of this term. Qumran and the early church cited the Old Testament phrase "the last days" but both did not think the cited prediction was exhausted in their time. We must distinguish between the hermeneutical principle of fulfillment and application. This is the view of Harris, "The Last Days in the Bible and Qumran" in *Jesus of Nazareth Savior and Lord*, ed. by C. H. Henry.

<sup>48</sup>S. Schechter: *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, ed. H. M. Orlinsky, (New York: ITAV, 1970 reprint), p. 38, n. 16.

We can find the eschatological meaning of  $\tau\omicron\upsilon$  or  $\lambda\iota\gamma$ , by putting the present situation against the coming times, for example: CDC 6:11, 12:23 (14:19); 19:10; 20:1; 1QS 9:11; 4QPB3. These texts all agree in terminology and also have similar contexts. After finishing the day of evil-doers, one of the characteristics of the future world will be new teaching and a new interpretation of the Law. In this sense, the Qumran people might project the historical Teacher of the Law into the future ideal Teacher of the Law.

(3) Such an expectation for a new Expounder of the Law in CDC is agreeable with the hope of later Judaism from 1 Maccabees to the Karaites literature.<sup>49</sup>

#### V. The Expounder of the Law.

##### A. In CDC 7:9-20

For convenience, I shall quote a part of the passage:

The 'Star' is the Expounder of the Law who comes to Damascus, as it is written: 'A star shall come forth out of Jacob, and a scepter shall rise out of Israel' - the 'Scepter' is the prince of all the congregation and when he stands up he will 'break down all the sons of Sheth'. (Num. 24:17)

Here we have to notice that we have two kinds of texts. The relationship of the two manuscripts is not clear, but the general opinion is that both are versions of a single archetype.<sup>50</sup> Text A and B continue to go parallel to each other and separate at MS A CDC 7:10 and MS B 19:7. Both use the formula of quotation  $\text{כִּי יִבְרָא הַדָּבָר}$  ; Text B quotes Zech. 13:7, and Text A quotes Isa. 7:17, adding the citation of Amos 5:26f and 9:11. After this both relate their material to the idea of the coming Messiahs (pl.).

<sup>49</sup>SB IV, 794-96.

<sup>50</sup>B. T. France, op. cit., p. 176, nn. 19 and 20.

Our present concern is to find the identification of the Expounder of the Law. Our text (CDC 7:19) gives two equations:

The Expounder of the Law = The Star

The Scepter = The prince of the whole congregation.

Some define the first as the Aaronic Messiah and the latter as the Davidic Messiah. And they find an exact parallel in the Book of the Testaments of Judah 24:1-6.

Then who is this Expounder of the Law? Is this a past figure or a future figure? There are two ways to define the term. The first depends upon the translation of the verb  $\lambda\iota\gamma$  in line 9. If we translate this by the perfect, we must seek a certain figure of the community.<sup>51</sup> But, if we translate it as a participle used for the future, this figure will be a future figure.

In the case that this figure was a past figure in Qumran history, what relationship has this figure to the Teacher of Righteousness? We can get some answer from the interpretation of  $\text{פְּשֻׁטָּה שֶׁנֶּאֱמָרָה}$ .<sup>52</sup> As archaeological evidence shows, in the case that the community activity migrated to the Damascus during Herod's reign (37-4 BC), the Expounder of the Law can hardly be the Teacher of Righteousness who founded the community at an earlier stage because the Expounder of the Law would seem to be a later leader. However, in the case that, as some scholars<sup>53</sup> think,

<sup>51</sup>Rowley: Teacher of Righteousness and the Dead Sea Scrolls, BJRL XL (1957) p. 143f. Orlinsky agrees. But Fitzmeyer sees it as the so-called prophetic perfect and future figure, ESBNT p. 26, n. 36. But is this possible in non-inspired literature?

<sup>52</sup>Rabin, translated it "From my tent to Damascus", op. cit., p. 28. Schechter, op. cit., p. 72, "From the Tents of Damascus."

<sup>53</sup>I. Rabinowitz, A Reconsideration of "Damascus" and the 390 years in the Damascus and Zadokite Fragments", JBL, LXXIII (1954), p. 11-35. T. H. Gaster, CDSS, p. 4, 24, 101.

"Damascus" is only a figurative expression of the Dea Sea wilderness to which the Community retired, then the Expounder of the Law might be the same as the Teacher of Righteousness who led the community to prepare in the wilderness the way of the Lord.

In any case, the context of our text is that the community is identified with the personal king (ךסד). Only this king possesses the "Law" (ךסד תהי) and the "prophets" (כ"י הן סמ'י), while other unfaithful men rejected these. So God will visit them according to their attitudes in the time of the Messiah, i.e., the Star and Staff according to the description of the A text of the Zadokite Fragments, and the Messiahs from Aaron and Israel according to the B Text. For this reason, it is better to understand אןן in the above contexts as the participle referring to the future. This אןן has also a future meaning in other Qumran texts: 1QpHab (1:3, 2:7, 2:10, 7:1, 4QpPs 37:64). Other Qumran quotations from Num. 24:17 also have a future hope, e.g., 4Q Test 12.

#### B. In 4Q Florilegium.

"He is the shoot of David who will arise with the Expounder of the Law who....in Zion in the latter days."

Here we can see clearly the figure of the Expounder of the Law as a future figure, but we cannot see any equation with the Expounder of the Law as given in other cases. But this Expounder of the Law is accompanied by another figure, i.e., the Scion of David. Therefore, this Expounder of the Law who accompanies the Scion of David cannot be the Davidic Messiah. As in CDC 7:19-20, the prophecy of Amos 9:11 is quoted to guarantee the identity of the two figures in 4Q Flor.

#### C. In 4Q Patriarchial Blessings.

In Chapter two, this text was quoted.

The Expounder of the Law in this text was reconstructed by the publisher, Allegro, and his reconstruction seems to this writer probably to be correct. If so, the expectation of the Expounder of the Law is mentioned in connection with the Davidic King Messiah here, too. As Allegro indicated, this would seem to underline the connection between the eschatological "Expounder of the Law" and the historical "men of the community", i.e., the Expounder of the Law is mentioned with the community people. This means that the hoped for Davidic shoot is supported by the authority of the Expounder of the Law or the Community.

#### D. Conclusions as to the Expounder of the Law.

In CDC 6, the Expounder of the Law was an historical figure but in the other two cases (4Q Flor. and 4QPB) he is a future figure. This Expounder of the Law in CDC 7 is also a future figure, although he was deeply involved in the community life. So the Expounder of the Law is intended to be a general title as 1QS 6:6 שרן שרן אןן indicates. We can find two supports for this theory: (i) wherever this appellation appears, another figure usually stands together with him. This figure is always the Davidic figures. (ii) in other Jewish literatures, this ἡγεμὼν νόμων also appear, but no personality is involved in this appellation (e.g., Sir. 32:15, I Macc. 14:14; Jub. 1:12, etc.).

The relation of this figure to the Teacher of Righteousness is not clear in Qumran texts published so far. We cannot find anywhere the equation of the Expounder of the Law with the Teacher of Righteousness.

F. F. Bruce speaks of their relation as follows: "The Expounder of the

Law...was the title given to the Teacher's successor as head of the community"<sup>54</sup> "but the last of the succession was to be a specially significant eschatological figure."<sup>55</sup> This means the first founder of the community can be called the Teacher of Righteousness or the Expounder of the Law and cannot be an eschatological figure. But the Qumran people might have hope for another Teacher or Expounder of the Law. If, however, the Qumran people equated the Expounder of the Law with the historical Teacher and saw messianic character in him, why did they use "indirect"<sup>56</sup> expressions and not more clear statements about him? How much clearer are the statements in the New Testament about the messiahship and the return of the Christ of the NT (Acts 1:11)!

Where the Expounder of the Law appears, we can see this figure is concerned with the interpretation of biblical passages, which is especially his duty. Certainly under the guidance of the Expounder of the Law, the Community had much concern about the strict understanding of the Law. They rejected "those who expounded smooth things" (אשר באהן בקולן CDC 1:18). They were "the men of perfect holiness ...according to the investigation of the Law (CDC 20:7). The content of their prayer was that there should not fail "to be a man who studies the Torah day and night continually" (1QS 6:6-7), unlike those who have not inquired after him in His statutes וְלֹא דָרְשָׁהוּ (1QS 5:11). In this sense it is natural to suppose that they gave their leader the honorable title יִרְרָה הַצַּדִּיק and also

<sup>54</sup>F. F. Bruce, The Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran Texts, (1957), p. 35.

<sup>55</sup>F. F. Bruce, BEQT, p. 48, 80 n. 38. Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls, (New York: Viking, 1958), p. 314.

<sup>56</sup>Cross, op. cit., p. 173.

expected the chief Expounder of the Law who will come to solve all their problems involved in the Law. And it is of interest to notice one fact: All fragments referring to the coming Davidic Messiah have the emphasis on the Law given through one additional figure, the Expounder of the Law or a figure of similar name (4QPB 15; 4Q Flor. col. 1, 1.14 and col. 2, 1.2, and 4Qp Isa<sup>a</sup>. Therefore, this writer asserts that the Expounder of the Law has priestly functions--at least the priestly function of interpretation of the Law.

#### VI. The Relation of the Shoot of David and the Expounder of the Law to the "Messiahs of Aaron and Israel".

As we have already observed, the Expounder of the Law as the last successor will be a significant eschatological figure. And also the Qumran Community, without doubt, expected the Davidic Messiah דָּוִד מֶלֶךְ צְדִיק מֵשִׁיחַ. That the Expounder of the Law and the Teacher of Righteousness belong to the priestly line<sup>57</sup> of the sect's messianic hope may be determined from their historical situation. The sect's terms of the messianic hope testify to this point, i.e., the terms "Messiahs of Aaron and of Israel", "Messiah from Aaron and Israel".

#### A. Two Messiahs or one Messiah in Qumran?

When the so-called Zadokite document (now Damascus Document) was first discovered at the Cairo Geniza in Egypt, the expressions: מֵשִׁיחַ אַחֲרָיִם (CDC 12:23f, 14:19, 19:20f) and מֵשִׁיחַ אַחֲרָיִם (CDC 20:1) gained attention from scholars.

<sup>57</sup>For the fact that the Teacher of Righteousness is a priest, cf. 4Q Ps37 Col. 2:15, 1QpHab 2:7-8, JBL LXXV (1956), pp. 94-95, and that the priest might be the expander of the Law, cf. 1QS 5:9-10; 6:6; CDC 13:1-8; 14:6-8.

Their attention was given not only because of the terminology, but also because of the eschatological contents. L. Ginzberg early expressed his opinion, somewhat hesitating to express it as a conviction, that the Community of the New Covenant had expected two Messianic figures: one priest Messiah from Aaron and the other Kingly Messiah from Israel.<sup>58</sup>

After this, this indefinite conclusion became a conviction because of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947. Moreover, the discovery of the fragments of the Damascus documents in caves (4:9, 5:10; 6:11) showed the relationship of the Old Zadokite documents to the newly discovered documents. And the words אגב אגב in 1QS 9:11 supported strongly the Ginzberg's hypothesis. Therefore, מ'שח in CDC, which is parallel with 1QS 1:11, should mean מ'שח two Messiahs, (plural).<sup>59</sup> So it happened that an emendation of texts was made by many scholars. Some regarded the plural reference as the community;<sup>60</sup> others regarded it as a Scribe's error, etc.<sup>61</sup>

Then why did the author of the Zadokite document use the singular מ'שח? This is, as suggested above, due to emendation (or error) of scribes in the middle ages, who did not understand the doctrine of two Messiahs. But the problem begins here. The scribes in

<sup>58</sup>L. Ginzberg, Eine Unbekannte Judische Sekte, quoted in R. Deichgraeber, Zun Messiaserwartung der Damaskusschrift ZAW, LXXVIII, (1966), pp. 333-43.

<sup>59</sup>Rabin, Zadokite Documents, p. 31, n. 21a.

<sup>60</sup>La Sor, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmann, 1972), p. 100.

<sup>61</sup>Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins, (London: Nelson, 1961), p. 157.

the Middle Ages were the Karaites who had also the doctrine of two Messiahs and understood it well. How could they not distinguish the singular from the plural clearly?

This opposite opinion has some further grounds, i.e., the earlier fragment CDC 14:9 which was discovered in Cave 4 (4QD<sup>b</sup>) still had the singular מ'שח. And another reason -- though I think this is not a decisive point--is that a fragment of the Manual of Discipline (4QSe)<sup>62</sup> omits the passage (1QS 9:11) entirely going from the words in 1QS 8:16 immediately to the words in 1QS 9:12. Based upon these facts, those who claim one Messiah in Qumran, want to apply this singular to all other Qumran documents. They see only one Kingly Messiah in the Qumran Texts. To do so, J. Starcky established a complicated and schematic development of Messianic expectation in the Qumran community.<sup>63</sup> He and others like, a priori, the one Messiah

<sup>62</sup>J. T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea, (London: SCM, 1959), p. 123, 4QSe is supposed to be older than 1QS.

<sup>63</sup>M. L'abbe Jean Starcky gives four stages of the development of the Messianic idea in Qumran (summarized in Fitzmeyer ESBNT pp. 129-40):

- A. Maccabean period (Ia. 153-109 B.C.):  
1QpHab, 4QpPs37, 1QH, 1QS, 1QSe (taking 8:15b-9:12) as belonging to this age. The titles "wonderful counselor" (QH 3:9-10) and מ'שח in QH 6:15; 7:19; 8:6, 8, 10 means "Community" so there is no messianism.
- B. Hasmonean period (Ib<sup>a</sup>, 142-63 B.C.):  
1QS, 4Q Testimonia. IQSa, IQSb. Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Jubilees and 4Q AhA belong to this period and represent two Messiahs.
- C. Pompeian period (Ib<sup>β</sup>, 63-37 B.C.):  
CDC 4QD<sup>b</sup> (95-50 B.C.) 4QarP and Psalms of Solomon represent one Messiah.
- D. Herodian period (Phase II 4 B.C. - 68 A.D.):  
IQM 4QPB, 4Q Flor., 4QpIsa<sup>aD</sup> and the parables of the Book of Enoch refer to one particular Messiah.

As to this theory, Brown and Fitzmeyer shifted their emphasis to other periods: "from the Hasmonean period on there was at Qumran an expectation of Two Messiahs, a special king and a special priest, anointed (and hence Messiahs) as kings and priests would be....But we do not

doctrine because the trend in main Judaism and in Christianity have been only one Messiah. So Qumran also cannot be exceptional. In Qumran there might be a notice of the priestly Messiah, "but not a messianic figure in the full sense".<sup>64</sup> We are not concerned about the question of who can be a Messiah in Qumran, but only the question of the doctrine of the Qumran people. Higgins reads, "the anointed ones" in IQS 9:11, not "the Messiahs".<sup>65</sup> But even M. de Jonge, standing with Higgins, admits finally:

"Having given a survey of recent opinion on the subject, this author comes to the conclusion that the reading  $\text{נְשִׂיחַ}$  is certainly correct from the aspect of text-criticism."<sup>66</sup>

But his solution excludes, in fact, the personal idea of the Messiah in the existential color: "God is free to achieve his end in the ways He chooses. He may use no human intermediaries, but only heavenly ones; He may also bring about the radical change in the circumstance of Israel and the world without any instrument at all."<sup>67</sup>

Therefore he rejects the idea of two Messiahs in Qumran.

But when we think about the peculiar social and religious background of the Qumran Sect, we understand their special terms for the

think there is sufficient evidence that during one period, the Pompeian period, this expectation was narrowed down to one figure who would be both prince and priest." R. F. Brown: J. Starcky's Theory of Qumran Messianic Development", CBQ XXVIII, (1966), pp. 51-57.

<sup>64</sup>A. J. B. Higgins, The Priestly Messiah, NTS XIII, pp. 211-39, 218.

<sup>65</sup>Higgins excludes the pluralistic Messiah in the list of Qumran literatures. Ibid., p. 215.

<sup>66</sup>M. de Jonge; op. cit.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., p. 63.

Messiah. They expected two Messiahs. We have many evidences for this:

1. In CDC we can see clearly two Messiahs. R. Deichgraeber defends this in CDC quite well,<sup>68</sup> for four reasons:

(a) In CDC 7:18-21 and 19:10f, as studied earlier, the two texts A and B have the same Messiahs:

Text B:	$\text{נְשִׂיחַ אַהֲרֹן וְיִשְׂרָאֵל}$	$\text{נְשִׂיחַ אַהֲרֹן}$
Text A:	$\text{וְשֵׁבֶט}$ and $\text{נְשִׂיחַ}$	$\text{נְשִׂיחַ}$
Or:	(Prince of all the Congregation)	(The Expounder of the Law)

(b)  $\text{נְשִׂיחַ אַהֲרֹן וְיִשְׂרָאֵל}$  in CDC is the Messiah from Aaron and the Messiah from Israel, not a Messiah from the community.

The defenders of one Messiah asserts that  $\text{אַהֲרֹן וְיִשְׂרָאֵל}$  means the community. But this phrase means clearly two different groups. Deichgraeber gives many examples for his theory:

(i) in CDC 14:3-6: Examination of the Members involves two groups.

(ii) in CDC 6:2f, IQS 8:5f, IQS 5:6,  $\beta$ :8f and CDC 1:7 the community started with two groups.

(iii) in CDC 10:5-6; IQS 5:21f. Members of the Court of Judgment are in groups.

(iv) in IQM 3:13f, IQM 5:1f. The order of the army is in several groups.

(c)  $\text{נְשִׂיחַ אַהֲרֹן וְיִשְׂרָאֵל}$  is plural even on grammatical

<sup>68</sup>Op. cit., pp. 333-43.

grounds. For examples, cf. ראש ערב וזאב  
(Jud. 7:25) and עמרים (Gen. 14:10). These  
are plural. And עם אלז ואתשם ישראל in שם  
אחר (1QM 3:13 also 1QM 3:13; 5:17) is singular  
but with a plural meaning.

- (d) Besides these, the writer wants to add another: If משיח  
is to be singular according to the 4QD<sup>b</sup> 14:19, this Messiah  
will be a priestly Messiah instead of a Kingly Messiah.

This would be against the view of one Kingly Messiah because  
the subject of משיח עונן in 14:19 is the Messiah of  
atonement—a priestly not a kingly Messiah.

2. In 1QS, especially 9:11 we see two Messiahs. The thing at issue  
here is: Did 1QS have three Messiahs, while CDC had two Messiahs?  
Wieder's solution is yes.<sup>69</sup> 1QS was composed before the appearance of  
the Teacher of Righteousness. After his appearance the community  
identified him with the expected prophet and expected him to fulfill a  
part of their hopes. About this Brownlee says, "probably the prophet  
came to be identified with the Teacher of Righteousness who had already  
come and so the future expectancy thus narrowed itself to that of the  
two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel."<sup>70</sup> For this phrase, there are many  
views. At least, this phrase means there were two or more Messiahs  
in view.

3. In 1QSa we can find משיח ישראל and [הכוהן המשיח].<sup>71</sup>  
And, although we accept the reconstruction of the first publisher's

<sup>69</sup>JTS IV, (1953), p. 171

<sup>70</sup>Brownlee, *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, p. 44.

<sup>71</sup>Ibid., pp. 54-64, Y. Yadin, "Crucial Passages in the Dead  
Sea Scrolls, JBL LXXVIII, pp. 238-59.

reading אמ יזיק [אף] א[ת] המשיח אתם,<sup>72</sup> I think two  
prominent eschatological figures appear instead of one kingly Messiah.  
The evidence of early absolute use of the Messiah appears in IV Esra 7:28f,  
12:32 and Syr. Bar. 29:3, 90:9<sup>15</sup>, etc.

4. In 1Qsb we find משיח העדה in 5:26f. Milik took 1Qsb 1:21-  
3:21 as one benediction of the eschatological high priest.<sup>73</sup> Among  
scholars there is debate about the order of the columns of 1Qsb. But  
as Liver says, "the placing of the benediction for the prince of the  
congregation after the benediction for the high priest and the benedic-  
tion for the priests, sons of Zadok is an established fact."<sup>74</sup>

5. In 4Q Testimonia we have some parallels to the passage in 1QS 9:11.  
We have studied these already above.

6. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. These show definite light  
on our two Messiahs. But this witness is post Christian and beyond  
the bounds of our study.

7. In 1QM the prince of the congregation may be the royal Messiah who  
will bear the martial standard (1QMt) as the hero of war whose sword  
devours the flesh of sinners and fills his palaces with precious booty  
(xiii 6-8), while the high priest will pronounce the "Progress in Time  
of War" as a pontifical blessing (15:4f).

8. In 4Q Florilegium משיח דוד is the messianic king from the  
Davidic line, while משיח התורה means the eschatological  
high priest.

<sup>72</sup>D. Barthelemy and J. T. Milik DJD Q Cave I, p. 118.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid., p. 121f.

<sup>74</sup>J. Liver, HTR LII, (1959), p. 155

Therefore, we see various appellations in Qumran: The Teacher of Righteousness; the Expounder of the Law; the Shoot of David; the Messiah of Aaron; and the Messiah of Israel. The Qumran people expected their Messiahs in the future. And they might give two honorific titles to their leader: The Teacher of Righteousness and Expounder of the Law. Their ideal Messiah would rise up from the elect community, of the living, not from the dead and be a co-worker with the Expounder of the Law. But we are not sure which Messiah is the Shoot of David - the Messiah of Aaron? or of Israel? or neither? Nonetheless, this writer suggests that the Expounder of the Law might be the priestly Messiah.

#### B. Significance of the Variety of Messianic Figures.

Then what does the variety of Messianic figures mean in Qumran? This fact should be faced against the background of the Qumran society and religion. Especially important is the "Shoot of David" appearing in later periods. Liver gives his view: Some school in the sect wished to repress the idea of a Davidic Messiah; others wanted to give it wider currency. These tendencies arose as a result of the historical development of the Community. While the Hasmonean Kingdom was prosperous the Messianic hope for the house of David was "a vague hope for the very distant future, but with the decline of the Hasmonean Kingdom, the Davidic Messianic idea became popular."<sup>75</sup>

M. Smith discusses it another way, although he is dealing with late Jewish literature not with the material of the Dead Sea Scrolls: "If the variety of eschatological prediction is any evidence, eschatology was, for the members of these groups, a comparatively arbitrary

<sup>75</sup>Liver, op. cit., pp. 162-63, 184.

and individual matter, part--and an important part--of their Weltanschauung, but a part about which the opinions of different members might, and did, differ quite widely."<sup>76</sup>

At least, we have to keep one thing in mind, that the Qumran Community, although we do not well know its last destiny, was a strong unit based upon the strict examination of new members.<sup>77</sup>

#### VII. The Rabbinic Understanding of Nathan's Promise.

The Rabbis did not understand this promise as messianic and applied II Sam. 7:14 to King Solomon.<sup>78</sup> And they interpreted a "place" (v. 10) as a place of prayer: R. Johanan (+279) said in the name of R. Simeon b Yohai (ca 150):

"If a man has a fixed place for his prayer, his enemies succumb to him. For it is said, I will appoint a place for my people Israel and will plant them, that they may dwell in this our place, and be disquieted no more: neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as at the first." (II Sam. 7:10)<sup>79</sup>

The Rabbis interpreted "to afflict them" as to "exterminate" ( לְהַשְׁחִיחַ ). The place of prayer was inviolable.<sup>80</sup> R. Albo b Naggasi (ca 320) understood "he sat" ( יָשָׁב ) as "er beruhigte sich" ( יָשָׁב ).<sup>81</sup> Anyway, the word "place" was spiritualized in rabbinic literature.

<sup>76</sup>M. Smith, "What is Implied by the Variety of Messianic Figures?" JBL LXXVIII, (1957), pp. 66-72.

<sup>77</sup>Goeran Forkman, The Limits of the Religious Community, (Lund: CWK Gleerap, 1972), pp. 39-86. But this writer cannot find any examination or expulsion of the members because of differing Messianic doctrine in the material gathered in this book. Is there any such evidence in Qumran Literature?

<sup>78</sup>SB III, 15.

<sup>79</sup>Berakoth 7b and 6b.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid.

<sup>81</sup>SB II, 36; cf. pPes. 5.32<sup>d</sup>; pJoma 3.40<sup>b</sup>, 45; and pSota 7.22<sup>a</sup>, 27; Midr. Sm. 27:31 (64b), Midr Ps 13:2 (hb).

VIII. The Understanding of the NT for Nathan's Promise.

In some sense it is no exaggeration to say that all the Davidic royal motifs in the New Testament were influenced by Nathan's promise to David. The concept of David as "seed" (Jn. 7:42; Acts 13:23; Rom. 1:3; II Tim. 2:8); of David's "shoot" (Mt. 2:23; Rev. 5:5, 22:16; Mk. 14:58); of his "sonship" with the deity (Mk. 9:7; Acts 3:24, etc.); of royal-priestly association (Lk. 1:32; Heb. 1:5, etc.); and of the eternity of his Kingdom (Lk. 1:37; Heb. 1:8; Rev. 11:15, etc.) pre-vails in the New Testament and all these are realized in one person: Jesus. We cannot cover the whole subject of royal motifs in the New Testament, but must deal here with it in limited aspects.

## A. The Seed of David.

The New Testament uses a very limited number of times the direct term "the Seed of David" as in the Old Testament (I Kgs. 11:39; Jer. 33:22, 21).<sup>82</sup> Direct references in the NT appear only in Jn. 7:42; Rom. 1:3-4 and II Tim. 2:8. But we have many allusions to it. In Qumran we do not find just the same phrase, but we find the same meaning in "To David and to his seed" etc. (4QPB).

John himself does not allude to Nathan's promise, but described the views of the multitude through the lips of those who heard Jesus. The multitude had an interest in Jesus' descent and birthplace. They had expressed their views, influenced by the Old Testament. So Jn. 7:42 may have been influenced by such verses as: II Sam. 7:12;

<sup>82</sup>The former means a "tribe", the latter refers to a coming future Messiah, cf. S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1959), p. 147.

22:51 = Ps. 18:51; 89:4, 30f.<sup>83</sup> In short, the multitude at that time had related Christ, the Messiah, to the Seed of David, but did not apply the term to Jesus speaking to them.

But in his synagogue sermon at Pisidian Antioch, Paul surveys the sequence of God's mighty acts from the Exodus to the establishment of the Davidic Monarchy and connects God's Heilsgeschichte of Israel to David's Seed, Jesus: "of this man's posterity (David's Seed) God has brought to Israel a Savior, Jesus, as he promised." In Acts 13:32-37, Paul proclaims that the true fulfillment of the promises made to David was achieved in "great David's greater son". Many commentators note the connection between Nathan's oracle and Paul's Pisidian sermon.

D. Goldsmith points out good literal parallels between the two...<sup>84</sup> "The Holy and sure blessings of David"<sup>85</sup> was fulfilled in a "Holy One" Jesus.

In Romans Paul refers to "the Seed of David according to the flesh" in his essential summary of the whole Roman epistle (Rom. 1:3-4). This "Seed of David" is a part of his Gospel in II Tim. 2:8. His Gospel is that very man and very God was dead and rose again.

<sup>83</sup>E. D. Freed, Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John, (Leiden: Brill, 1965), pp. 39-59.

<sup>84</sup>D. Goldsmith: "Acts 13:33-37: A Peshier on 2 Samuel", JBL, LXXXVII, (1968), pp. 321-324. But he asserts Jesus' eternal sonship through the resurrection.

<sup>85</sup>The advantage of the translation of the Hebrew קָדוֹשׁ into ὁσία instead of into the usual ἅγιος is to connect Isa. 55:3 with the "holy one" of Ps. 16:10.

## B. The Shoot and Root of David in the New Testament.

The Shoot and Root motif must be considered here, although these terms do not appear in II Samuel 7. But the verb of 2 Samuel 23:5 already unites the messianic hope with the Shoot motif.<sup>86</sup> The Shoot reference cannot be found explicitly in the New Testament. The Old Testament and Qumran have this Shoot motif. But Mk. 14:58<sup>87</sup> is supposed to imply this motif, "I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another, not made with shovel".<sup>88</sup> This is derived from the prophecy of Zech. 6:12-15, "The man whose name is the Branch...he shall build the temple of the Lord". Targum to Isa. 53:5, "He shall build the sanctuary that was polluted because of our transgressions". In Jesus' contemporary Judaism, some believed that God would raise up a new temple in the last days and also "the expectation of a new temple is linked with a negative to the existing sanctuary"<sup>89</sup> (cf. Mk. 2:12). Anyway, Jesus implied the resurrection of his body and the messianic creation of a true community for worship. But the multitude misunderstood Jesus' word about the temple, and did not believe in the promised Branch (Mk. 15:29).

But the motif of neser and Root are explicitly found in the New Testament. In Mt. 2:23, he "dwelt in a city called Nazareth, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets. He shall be called

<sup>86</sup>J. B. Payne, Encyclopedia of Biblical Prophecy, (New York: Harper and Row, 1973), p. 227.

<sup>87</sup>Mt. 26:61; Mk. 15:29; Mt. 27:40; Jn. 2:13.

<sup>88</sup>France, op. cit., pp. 99-100. E. E. Ellis, The Gospel of Luke, (New York: Nelson, 1966), p. 191, 229f.

<sup>89</sup>D. Flusser and Y. Yadin, IEJ IX, (1959), p. 95.

a 'Nazarene'". Scholars debate the source of the cited phrase because we cannot find any expression in literal form in the Old Testament.<sup>90</sup> And some suggested allusions are not enough to satisfy the cited purpose of Matthew: Gundry, after surveying several possible sources, concludes:

"*Nazarene* denotes one  $\lambda\alpha\omicron\upsilon\ \nu\alpha\zeta\alpha\rho\epsilon\theta$ , the designation came to be used contemptuously, and that Matthew related it to the honorific Messianic title  $\gamma\epsilon\mu\epsilon\lambda$  in Isa. 11:1 (perhaps in connection with Messianic passages--Isa. 4:2; Jer. 23:5, 33:15; Zech. 3:8, 6:12) with emphasis on the lowliness and contemptibility out of which Jesus appeared. This lowliness is portrayed in the lowly stump of David and in various prophetic passages (Ps. 22; Isa. 53; Zech. 9, 11, 12)--hence the plural  $\delta\alpha\lambda\ \tau\omega\upsilon\ \pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\ \tau\omega\upsilon$ "<sup>91</sup>

In fact Isaiah 11:1 has been long recognized as a messianic verse. Especially note that the Targum inserts the word "Messiah". As we studied, the Qumran community represents a suffering  $\gamma\epsilon\mu\epsilon\lambda$  in a low-estate.

For Paul, the Root of Isaiah is Jesus. He is the conqueror to rule the Gentiles and the object of all mankind's faith (Rom. 15:12). In Revelation Jesus testifies to Himself:

"I am the root and the offspring of David".

It is significant to find these messianic terms in Revelation, in which Jesus declared he is The Alpha and The Omega (Rev. 5:5, 22:16).

## C. The Son's Superiority to the Angels.

The author of Hebrews cites II Sam. 7:14 in order to praise Jesus, the Son's, unique and superior status: "For unto which of the angels

<sup>90</sup>For this subject: C. H. Toy: Quotations in NT, (1884), pp. 12-16.

<sup>91</sup>R. H. Gundry, op. cit., pp. 97-100.

said he at any time 'Thou art my Son, This day have I begotten thee?' (Ps. 2:7) and again: 'I will be to him a Father and he shall be to me a Son' (2 Sam. 7:14) (Heb. 1:5). God did not call anyone (even the angels) "my son" (singular). He applied this unique name only to Jesus (Mk. 1:11). This fact of Jesus' superiority was guaranteed by the resurrection from the dead (Rom. 1:3). In any case, Hebrews employ Samuel's verse to prove that the son, Jesus, enjoys a relationship with the Father superior to that of the angels. As we said earlier, 4Q Flor. also employs this verse of Samuel to prove the inviolability and perpetuity of the Community and at the same time to relate it to the Shoot of David. The Psalms of Solomon also represent the superiority of the Son of David (17:23, 36; 18:6.8). This expected hope was fulfilled in the earthly Jesus and will yet be consummated in the future. This futuristic hope is celebrated in Gabriel's words of annunciation to Mary:

"He will be great  
and will be called the Son of the Most High  
And the Lord God will give to him  
the throne of his father David." (Lk. 1:8)<sup>92</sup>

#### D. The Holy Children in the Holy Congregation:

While Paul is urging the holiness of the congregation in the Corinthian church, he is appealing to the motive of holiness promised in 2 Samuel 7:14, namely, God's presence:

"I will be to you a father (II Sam. 7:14)  
you will be to me sons and daughters  
says the Lord Almighty (II Sam. 7:8) (II Cor. 6:18)

<sup>92</sup>E. Ellis links this with 4Q Flor. 11:10-11, op. cit., p. 71.

As we already saw, Paul cited this verse to prove Jesus' sonship and superiority to the rest of creation. But this time he applies the same verse to the congregation. Here, as Dr. Harris asserts, we must distinguish the fulfillment and application of the same verse.<sup>93</sup> The true fulfillment of this verse is found in Jesus. But this same verse is still applicable to any one or any appropriate situation of those who follow Jesus. Paul applied this verse to his contemporary congregation, but he did not do this without a slight change of the text.

Before going on to explain this text, it is necessary to draw a comparison between II Cor. 6:14-7:1 and 4Q Flor. because some scholars<sup>94</sup> deal with the Corinthian text in the light of Qumran. But we must know that, even before 4Q Flor. was discovered, these six passages in Corinthians were already discussed by critics. The reason is, as A. Plummer wrote (1915), "this strongly worded admonition to make no compromise with heathenism comes in so abruptly here that a number of critics suppose that it is a fragment of another letter and more maintain that the fragment is not by St. Paul", i.e., II Cor. 6:12 seems to continue in 7:2. For this issue, some suggestions were presented.<sup>95</sup> But with the new light of the Qumran texts, the Corinthian passages were interpreted in line with the Qumran tradition: Kuhn concluded that

<sup>93</sup>R. L. Harris, "The Last Days in the Bible and Qumran", op. cit., p. 79.

<sup>94</sup>K. G. Kuhn, RB LXI, (1954), n. 1. Also ET XI, (1961), p. 74. P. Benoit, "Qumran and the New Testament" in *Paul and Qumran*, ed. by J. Monghy-O'Conner, (London: G. Chapman, 1961); J. A. Fitzmeyer, CBQ 23 (1961), p. 271-80; ESRNT Chapter 10, R. Gaertner, op. cit., 1-49f.; F. F. Bruce, *I and II Corinthians*, (London: Oliphant, 1971), pp. 263-67.

<sup>95</sup>Plummer, ICC, in loc.

"Paul is perhaps citing here precisely an Essene Text".<sup>96</sup> P. Benoit called the passage "a meteor fallen from the heaven of Qumran into Paul's epistle"<sup>97</sup> (p5), while Fitzmeyer regarded it as "a paragraph in which Qumran idea and expressions have been reworked in a Christian cast of thought"<sup>98</sup> by someone other than Paul. This theory of interpolation, Bruce called "a Christian bibliographical improbability".<sup>99</sup>

In any case, our present concern, admitting the independence of each literature, is to compare the thought of both citations from II Sam. 7. First let us paraphrase these:

II. Cor. 6:18-7:1	4Q Flor. 1 11 (cf II Sam. 7:14)
I will be to you <i>ΣΜΙΝ</i>	I will be to him <i>ΔΟΥΤΩ</i>
a father, and	a father and
you will be to me <i>ΕΣΕΣΘΕ ΜΟΙ</i>	he shall be to me <i>ΕΣΤΑΙ ΜΟΙ</i>
sons and daughters	a son
<i>ΕΙΣ ΥΙΟΥΣ ΚΑΙ ΘΥΓΑΤΕΡΑΣ</i>	<i>ΕΙΣ ΥΙΟΥ</i>
says the Lord Almighty	
since we have all these	He is the Shoot
promises <i>ΤΑΥΤΑΣ ΤΑΣ ΕΞΑΓΓΕΛΙΑΣ</i>	of David who
beloved, let us cleanse	will arise
ourselves from all filthiness	with the Expounder
of flesh and spirit, making	of the Law
perfect holiness in the year	
of God.	

<sup>96</sup>Fitzmeyer, op. cit., p. 217.

<sup>97</sup>Quoted from Bruce, I and II Corinthians, p. 214.

<sup>98</sup>Fitzmeyer, op. cit., p. 217.

<sup>99</sup>Bruce, I and II Corinthians, p. 214.

A "son" in 4Q Flor. represents the Community. This Community is a bearer of purity, holiness, and perpetuity: These are guaranteed by the future promise of a coming Shoot of David. Here the foundation of Community (temple and dynasty) is the future hope: the coming of David's Shoot. Therefore, the citation of II Sam. 7:14 was, in a part, fulfilled in the Qumran Community. Nevertheless this community felt its imperfection and limitation especially in the twilight of its fate and they projected their hope into the coming Davidic Messianic figure.

But we cannot, in Paul's citation of II Sam. 7, see any link to a future Messianic idea. He only actually applies it to the circumscribed congregation by the inaugurated Lord, so he altered "him" to "you" (*ΣΜΙΝ*). Paul is appealing for separation on the basis of "these promises" (II Sam. 7:14, including Jer. 3:9, 32:38; Hos. 1:10; Isa. 34:6; Ex. 25:38; Ezk. 11:26, 36:28, 37:27a; and Lev. 26:12). This promise, i.e., the Lord's presence is a present motive for holiness of the congregation. In 4Q Flor. also the motive of holiness in community is based on God's dwelling (1.5). But although they only were holy people,<sup>100</sup> and served the Lord with perfect obedience to the Law (1.7), they still related their current community to the more perfect and future hope.

But the meaning of the New Testament was fulfilled in another way. R. V. G. Tasker may be quoted here:

"It was only when the Christ, born of the seed of David, dwelt in the hearts of those who accepted His sacrifices and submitted themselves to the guidance of His spirit, that God

<sup>100</sup>I followed Gaster's translation for 4Q Flor. 1.4. Allegro, and many, regard *ΨΙΤΡ* as "angels". See C.H.W. Brekelman's "The Saints of the Most High and Their Kingdom" in *Oud Testament-liche Studien*, (Leiden: Brill, 1965), WIV, 305-29.

became to them really a Father and they became His Sons and daughters. Until the barrier of sin had been finally removed by the perfect sacrifice of the Messiah, and the effects of that sacrifice made available for all men by the resurrection, the filial relationship between God and Man was not fully a reality."<sup>101</sup>

<sup>101</sup>Tasker, The Old Testament in the New Testament, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), p. 101.

論文集 (제13집)

1985년 7월 1일 인쇄

1985년 7월 10일 발행

발행인 洪 礪 植  
편 집 고신대학출판부  
인쇄처 釜山日報社출판국  
등록번호 1978. 9. 25 제카2-57

606 부산시 영도구 동삼동 149-1 전화: 412-8062~4

600 부산시 서구 암남동 34 전화: 26-3181~2