A SOCIAL DESCRIPTION OF THE DAMASCUS DOCUMENT

A SOCIAL DESCRIPTION OF THE DAMASCUS DOCUMENT

By

JOHN W. MARTENS

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

September 1986

Master of Arts (1986) McMaster University

Religious Studies Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: A Social Description of the Damascus Document

AUTHOR: John W. Martens

SUPERVISOR: Dr. Stephen Westerholm

NUMBER OF PAGES: vii, 165

ABSTRACT

Recent Biblical scholarship has acknowledged and stressed the sociological factors at play in the formation and continuing development of religious beliefs and in the structure of religious communities. By examining the text of the Damascus Document (CD), this thesis attempts to reconstruct the social structure of the CD community, and suggests reasons for its origins and development based on the social forces which contributed to its self-definition.

The first chapter examines the problem of deriving historical information from texts which are not strictly historical, and suggests a methodology which allows for the extraction of social reality from religious texts. Following this, a date of origination is suggested, the historical period examined, and the origins of the community described.

The second chapter discusses the community's self-definition, and the implications this definition and a new social situation had on their belief and community structure. An analysis of the community's response is then offered.

The third chapter examines modern sectarian theory in relation to the CD community. Using the information of the

previous two chapters, the CD community is discussed as a sect and compared to another sectarian movement. The conclusions deal with the community's unique role in the religious fabric of ancient Palestine, and with their common role as a sect.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Stephen Westerholm for his support and insight during the supervision of this thesis. The criticism and invaluable advice offered at each stage of the research and writing process is a major reason why this thesis has been completed. I must also thank him for his patience, his encouragement, and his constant willingness to listen. Dr. Louis Greenspan was also pivotal in the formation and development of this thesis. His help with the sociological material helped narrow and focus a seemingly unwieldly bunch of data. As well, I would like to thank Drs. B. F. Meyer and E. P. Sanders for their critical reading of the text of the thesis and their fine comments.

Finally, I wish to thank Jo-Ann Martens, my wife, without whom I could not have written this thesis; to her I must say: no shadow falls between your face and the dream.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
The Need for New Questions	1
The Defence of the Sociological Method	3
The Use of the Damascus Document	9
The Use of Sociological Method and Theory	11
CHAPTER ONE	22
The Method and the Problem	22
The Dating	25
The Origins of the Community	34
CHAPTER TWO	54
The Chosen Community	55
The "Laws"	62
i) Social Relations	66
ii) Purity and Sabbath Regulations	75
iii) Organizational Regulations	86
An Analysis	91
CHAPTER THREE	97
What is a Sect?	100
The Community as Sect	103
i) Origination	104
ii) The Application of the Ideal-Type	109

An Examination of Sectarian Sub-Types 121

The Comparison 126

CONCLUSIONS 139

FOOTNOTES 148

BIBLIOGRAPHY 162

INTRODUCTION

The Need for New Questions

The Damascus Document (CD) is best approached with a simple injunction in mind: to avoid "the assumption that the Qumran phenomenon is more or less understood."[1] There is much work to be done on fundamental issues, says P. R. Davies, and even more work to be done on fundamental misconceptions.[2] This state of affairs is not unique to Qumran studies, and should not be considered a negative condition. If the Qumran phenomenon is not yet understood, then what is called for is continued and revitalized questioning. If the old questions have yet to yield satisfactory answers, then new approaches, new hypotheses, and new questions are necessary.

In an attempt to grapple with the fundamental issues of the Damascus Document, this thesis modestly proposes the introduction of a new approach and new questions. Recent New Testament scholarship has stressed the social forces at play in the formation and continuation of religious communities. If Davies is correct in his assessment of Qumran studies, then perhaps a new set of questions is advisable.

The application of a sociological method has not been attempted in a systematic manner with the Damascus Document. Early Christianity has proven a useful ground for the methods of sociology, which has furthered our understanding of the volatile culture of Palestine and the complex religious landscape of the period. Sociology may prove itself equally useful in the study of the Damascus Document. For the issue, as Robin Scroggs rightly points out, is not one of correctness, but whether sociological methods make us think about texts in new ways.[3]

No mention can be made of the sociological method in Biblical studies, though, without leaping at once to its defence by constructing proofs for the necessity of its existence. A defence is necessary for the offence does not rest. The objections levelled against a sociological method have a certain consistency and deliberateness. Whatever the validity of certain of these objections, they should not lead to Cyril Rodd's conclusion that historical sociology is an impossible and useless endeavour.[4] All historical sociologists engaging in a social scientific approach face the same objections as to the desirability of their methodology. Bruce Malina, in his paper "The Social Sciences and Biblical Interpretation," outlines the most common objections offered against the use of a sociological method.[5]

The Defence of the Sociological Method

The first objection is that the approach is reductionistic, hence dangerous and false.[6] Daniel Pals explains the controversy by saying:

> In simplest terms, reductionists are those who insist that religion is best understood by going outside religion to explain it. In various ways their theories are concerned to show that a religious phenomenon - let us say, belief in God, or an act of ritual - owes its existence to non-religious causes.[7]

Secondly, social scientists find the approach of historical sociology well-founded theoretically, but impossible given the inadequacies of the data. As Scroggs sees it, most sociologists would be "aghast" to see the limited data available in many texts.[8] Thirdly, many historians and theologians do not believe that a sociological method, replete with determinism, is capable of addressing the distinctiveness of religious experience and change. Though similar to the first objection, this asks that even if religion is accepted as a phenomenon sui generis, can a sociological approach respect or understand that which is uniquely religious? Finally, conclusions which are arrived at through sociological methods are often similar to those arrived at through existing historical-critical methods or the scholar's personal intuition, rendering a sociological method superfluous.

Each of these objections asks, why a sociological method? Each response offered here will act as an apologia for the necessity of a sociological method. A sociological approach need not be reductionistic, though most certainly it can be. When sociology subsumes all other disciplines beneath it, as though they were explainable solely by it, then it is reductionistic. Sociology need not lead to reductionism. This is an unjustifiable fear. When Daniel Pals, following Eliade, Otto, et al., claims that "religious beliefs are creations of the human spirit which express insights and grasp realities in a manner that cannot be explained away," he meets with great sympathy on the part of Biblical sociologists.[9] The majority accept that there is something irreducible about the religious experience.

Yet, as Scroggs points out, "Gerd Thiessen speaks for many of us when he notes a rising Unbehagen about a discipline which limits the acceptable methods to the historical and theological."[10] No one doubts the importance of these two methodologies, but they do not ask, let alone answer, all of the necessary questions. Scroggs goes on to say:

> Interest in the sociology of early Christianity is no attempt to limit reductionistically the reality of Christianity to social dynamic, rather it should be seen as an effort to guard against the other extreme, a limitation of the reality of Christianity to an inner-spiritual, or objective-cognitive system. In short, sociology of early Christianity wants to put body and soul together again.[11]

There are two positive benefits of this "putting together." John G. Gager outlines them as follows: it presents the earliest Christians as total human beings, as whole people; as well, the discovery of continuities in religious experience between then and now recaptures the basic humanity which transcends distinctions of time and place.[12] These observations serve not to undermine religious studies, but to widen their scope. If "the texts do not speak to us, until we begin to speak to them, and they always answer us in our own language, whether it be sociological or theological," then asking sociological questions of Qumran material is long overdue.[13] Sociological questions, coupled with an allowance for the irreducible nature of religion, expands the horizons of the study of the religious experience.

The second objection regards the paucity of data in most religious texts. Although the Damascus Document is the best suited of all Qumran writings for examination by a sociological method, the lack of data is a reality. Yet, this need not become a fatal stumbling-block. Rodd is correct when he says:

> there is a world of difference between sociology applied to contemporary society, where the researcher can test his theories against evidence which he collects, and historical sociology where he has only fossilized evidence that has been preserved by chance or for very different purposes from that of the sociologist. It is a cardinal error to move promiscuously between the two.[14]

There is indeed a world of difference between historical sociology and contemporary sociology, but the difference includes what they attempt to achieve.

Historical sociology is not prediction strategy, as much modern sociology is.[15] It does not seek to know or speculate on the future. Rodd asserts elsewhere that a theory is essentially a set of suppositions of what is likely to happen in a certain situation given a certain set of circumstances. Historical sociology turns the equation upside down and asks, "If this is what has happened, how does it support or diminish modern sociological theory?" Fossilized evidence may be ideal ground for the testing of modern hypotheses: the snapshot has been taken, the evidence is there, unchangeable. Some portion of the whole picture may be missing, but Scroggs maintains that "if our data evidence some <u>parts</u> of the gestalt of a known model, while being silent about others, we may cautiously be able to conclude that the absence of the missing parts is accidental and the entire model was actually a reality."[16]

As to the promiscuous movement which Rodd warns against, a short reply is in order. Rodd's difficulty stems from a basic disagreement about the nature of sociological evidence. An awareness of cultural relativity is what Rodd calls for; above all, the sociologist is sensitive to this. What the sociologist desires, however, is a methodology

which transcends cultural relativity by testing hypotheses for generalities and commonalities.[17] A sociological method seeks cultural transference in order to ascertain what, if anything, is common among cultures. Rodd elsewhere asserts that historical sociology "makes it all too easy to adjust the evidence to fit the theory."[18] This is a red herring. The improper use of evidence does not necessarily wend its way home to rest at the feet of a social scientific method. The chance that evidence may be adjusted to suit personal theoretical concerns is not a valid reason for the abandonment of any theoretical approach. Unless Rodd believes that, because it <u>can</u> occur, it <u>will</u>, his argument must be rejected.

The third objection deals with the nature of sociological methodology. Sociology believes that those things which are thought to be "free," such as human beings, are actually limited by social reality and social influences. Therefore, an acceptance of the validity of sociological methodology is dependent upon an acceptance of the reality of social facts. Malina says it well:

> Social sciences are based upon models of how the world of human interaction works and why it works that way. Specifically the social sciences look to how meanings are imposed on men and seek to explain human behaviour in terms of typicalities.[19]

While not denying the freedom and responsibility inherent in the religious, or human, experience, the sociologist claims

that the necessity of his approach lies in the influential nature of social reality. Human beings are in constant interaction with the social world and socially constructed reality; that a social world is imposed upon humans does not render us pawns or unthinking automatons. Durkheim himself states that "the most complex forms of civilization are only a development of the psychological life of the individual."[20] Of course, once developed, society gains a discrete life of its own, which must be studied as such.

The uniqueness of a given society, its special status in human history, may become apparent through sociological methodology. If generalities and commonalities are located, what remains is the distinctiveness of the society. Malina argues persuasively that "for the interpretation of texts from the past, some sets of models of the social-science-with-history sort are necessary to deal with imposed meanings in the past so that the distinctive, particular, and different might emerge in some validatable, testable, and articulate way."[21] A sociological method seeks understanding of the common and, by way of attrition, finds the unique. That it seeks the common, the deterministic core of the methodology, rests on its theoretical presuppositions about the nature of social reality. That it finds the common is evidence that the search is valid.

The final objection asks why a sociological method is used if more traditional methods produce the same results. A sociological approach will not necessarily lead to the same answers; it is not certain that traditional methods will offer up the same conclusions. The chance that they might is not a good enough reason to abandon either approach. A sociological method offers meaning based on a validatable and testable method.[22] More than that, though, it is a new approach, one which bears witness to Gager's claim that

> new answers arise not so much from new data as from new questions; and new questions, I wish to argue, arise from new theories, new hypotheses, and new assumptions.[23]

The desire to bring a sociological method to the study of the Damascus Document is the desire to bring new questions, new theories, and new assumptions to the fundamental issues and misconceptions of the Qumran phenomenon. This study is an affirmation of Marcus Borg's contention that the time is right to construct a building from new stones, because the old stones are crumbling.[24]

The Use of the Damascus Document

The process of building begins for us with the Damascus Document. This study is rooted in the concrete: the study of one text of one group. The decision to work with only the Damascus Document has been arrived at for a variety of

reasons. The initial reason is a desire to concentrate on the group in question as the document presents them. Much of the conjecture in Qumran studies has centred on group identification, i.e. whether the community in question is the Essenes or some other identifiable group. This may be a byproduct of the research, but less importance should be placed on attaching a label to the document than on shedding light on how the document presents itself. Little is known of the group called the Essenes, and to spend time attempting to shoehorn what is known of them into the limited space created by the Damascus Document would distract us from the intent of this study.

The exclusive use of the Damascus Document is justified on two further grounds. No two Qumran documents have been certainly identified as products of the same community. At any rate, the chronological differences between the documents may mean that they are responses to different social forces and factors. It seems methodologically preferable to confine our attention to one discrete document rather than risk being misled by similarities between various documents into the assumption that the same social reality is presupposed. Such caution may seem contradictory for a study which wishes to herald new questions, new hypotheses, and new approaches; if so, I admit to this contradictory trend and remain true to it. Finally, the Damascus Document is

inherently suitable for sociological research. Its suitability on the level of content lies in the combination of history, law, and warnings. The author of the Damascus Document has taken care to examine and explain the community's role and purpose in Israel's past, present, and future. Though not explicitly sociological, the nature of the historiographal, legal, and prophetic utterances provide an excellent base from which to conduct historical sociology.[25] For these reasons, the Damascus Document stands alone as the subject of our study.

The Use of Sociological Method and Theory

Less homogenous is the methodology employed: it represents an attempt to synthesize and modify many diverse trends within the sociological tradition in order to apply them to the richness of one community's religious experience and history. Inasmuch as many of the strands of thought integrated into this peculiar synthesis have been modified in the process, the authors of the particular theories may find an injustice done to their thought. Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann address the same situation, though on a far grander scale, in the introduction to the Social Construction of Reality. They admit that they "cannot be faithful to the original intentions" of the disparate streams of social theory, they admit that they "do violence" to social thinkers by integrating their approach into an alien theory,

yet justify their approach by stating that "historical gratitude is not in itself a scientific virtue."[26] Their desire is to construct a workable, logical theory. If the ingredients are many, the result may be a grand success, or an abysmal failure!

This being the case, is the mélange of theoretical ingredients desirable or appropriate? Historical sociologists, under the watchful gaze of both Biblicists and social scientists, cannot afford a false move. Scroggs asks and answers the question:

> If we use more than one method, are these compatible or in tension? Thiessen implies by his work, probably correctly, that an eclecticism and pluralism is appropriate.[27]

A pluralistic approach is especially appropriate if the role of the historical sociologist is to locate a variety of truths not evident to historical or theological inquiry. The role of the sociologist is not to grind a theoretical axe, but to add a missing factor to the equation of religious experience. It goes without saying that a pluralistic methodology is appropriate for historical sociology only so long as it makes internal, sociological sense.

Emile Durkheim's The Rules of Sociological Method is the bedrock on which this study is grounded. His initial assumptions, that there is a social reality sui generis and that social facts are things, are accepted. As Durkheim explains:

> Collective representations, emotions, and tendencies are caused not by certain states of the consciousness of individuals but by the conditions in which the social group in its totality is placed.[28]

To understand a social group, the conditions in which it arose must be known. These conditions, or social facts, are not the product of the individual will. Rather, "the determining cause of a social fact should be sought among the social facts preceding it and not among the states of the individual consciousness."[29] This is not meant to imply a degradation of the individual will or consciousness, but to allow that there exists a social reality apart from the individual.

Social reality exists in a dialectical relationship between ideas and institutions. Werner Stark theorizes that social reality is a process, a happening, not a static reality.[30] In the happening of, the flow of social reality, two separate poles inform and are informed by the centre. The social process realizes itself, in Stark's terminology, through the dialectical relationship between mental inwardness and the external world.[31]

The nature of things, human consciousness included, is seen to be socially influenced to some degree. The basis of social influence, so far as human thought is concerned, is found in the process of social interaction.[32] This insight is derived from the sociology of knowledge which "contends

that beliefs and actions are determined by social circumstances and that when these circumstances change the beliefs and actions will change accordingly."[33] While we may wish to weaken "determination," social circumstances, or social forces, do at least influence social responses.

Gerard L. DeGre calls Durkheim the foremost pioneer in the sociology of knowledge.[34] DeGre sees the foundation Durkheim has laid for the sociology of knowledge in his decisive proof "that human knowledge is intimately interconnected with social processes, and that individual thinking is largely constrained and directed by ideal normative factors arising through human association."[35] Durkheim, according to DeGre, attempts to describe the interrelatedness of social structure, religious attitudes, and the categories of thought.[36] These three factors produce the necessary elements for sociological interpretation: the social facts to be interpreted (the ideational superstructure), the objective socio-historical situations (the substructure), and the subjective motivational factors (the attitudinal structures).[37] A community's beliefs and actions must be understood in the context of the social forces at play and the wider social reality of its time and place.

This is the basic foundation of the sociology of knowledge: human reality is in part socially constructed real-

ity. Human knowledge, therefore, is intimately connected with social processes. If human knowledge is seen to reside in texts and, more specifically, in language, then they are capable of revealing social reality to us. To study a text from the perspective of the sociology of knowledge is to place front and centre the question of language and the social function of language.[38] How does one relate language and social realities? Which social realities are related to the given text? For the historical sociologist

> the world we live in, the world we think, or assume, has ontological foundations is really socially constructed and is created, communicated and sustained through language and symbol.[39]

So says Robin Scroggs, who goes on to claim that "theological language and the claims made therein can no longer be explained without taking into account socio-economic-cultural factors in the production of that language."[40] Language refers us to, and is a product of, a cultural time and place. This does not mean that language cannot be understood as language, a bearer of meaning, beyond the context in which it was written; it does mean that the context in which language is formed offers information and instruction regarding the text (language) which can be found nowhere else. To account for context should not diminish the function of language as a bearer of meaning without reference beyond the text itself.

Before we proceed, a clarification and a corrective are in order. The clarification asks that this methodology not be considered a Functionalist approach, though its reliance on Durkheim is clear. "For Functionalists, the elements of social life must be understood in terms of the contributions they make to the stability of the whole."[41] What this means is that religion can be viewed only as an integrating and domesticating influence in a society. This basic premise of Functionalist thought will be rejected, by arguing that religion can also act as a creative and conflict-producing force.

The corrective regards the nature of religion and the religious experience as held by the sociology of knowledge and Durkheim. Gregory Baum explains Durkheim's understanding of religion by saying: "For Durkheim society began with religion. Religion was the primary reality."[42] Yet this primary reality is simply "society becoming conscious of itself."[43] I would argue that the impulse to religion is the impulse toward God, and that this impulse has ontological foundations which are irreducibly religious. Religion is the primary reality in that the movement toward God is the primary reality. Religion is not simply a force created by, and legitimating, the social order, but the reality sui generis which interacts with a social reality sui generis. This interaction transforms religion; it may

legitimate the social order or it may critique it. Religious ideals become socially grounded and socially transformed, but the impulse to religious experience is not socially created.

Religion, as already stated, does not simply prop up the status quo or function as a legitimating force in the establishment of social o rder. The understanding of religion just expounded denies this functionalist trend. Interestingly, Gregory Baum discerns in Durkheim's thought a similar denial of functionalism. Baum believes that for Durkheim

> religion celebrates the deepest values operative in the social order, commemorates the moments in the history of society when its nature found the highest expression, and draws a symbolic image of what the society is meant to be in the future.[44]

Religion seems to defend social order, but intriguingly it can also contribute to its dissolution. Durkheim believes that religion generates prophecy, but when the prophet criticizes his community he does so on the basis of what his community should be. His values and vision stem from the very society from which he is alienated; his alienation and subsequent protest stem from the society's inability to remain true to the spirit of the highest societal values.[45] The prophet criticizes the community in light of its ideals and embodies, more truthfully, the religion as it should be. "What is involved in prophecy then is not the appli-

cation of reason to religion but an act of fidelity to the genius of the inherited religion."[46] While the prophet maintains fidelity to religion in its highest ideal, he rejects that religion as it is. The prophet responds to, and produces, crisis points which do not function in the maintenance of the social order. Instead, the prophet generates a critique of the social order and calls out for change.

It is this understanding of Durkheim which leads to our initial understanding of the CD community; it will be argued that on the basis of the textual, and other, evidence they arose in alienation and protest. When a group of people in a given society become alienated from the established religious order, they are unable to identify fully with their society. This lack of identification, while painful, leads the group to honestly assess and critique the society, an act of protest against it. This perspective adheres to the principle that, "to be estranged, to be marginalized, to be deeply hurt by the system offers the possibility of analyzing more correctly the discrepancies and inequities of the social order."[47] While the issue of the correctness of the protest may be discarded, the interpretation of its origination is accepted.

When alienation leads to protest among a group of people, often there is further social response, in self-

definition and in the construction of a new community. This is the case with the CD community. How did they respond to the social forces of alienation? In Karl Mannheim's terminology the CD community expresses utopic values.[48] Mannheim contrasts utopian religion with ideological religion. Ideological religion legitimates the social order; utopic religion reveals the ills of the present social order, undermines this social order, and speaks of the downfall of the present social order. The CD community betrays the three aspects of an apocalyptical consciousness: society is evil; society must be destroyed; and a new society is about to be created, free from old injustices.[49] Without this utopian imagination, no new thought and no new action take place in society.[50] The utopic community displays a deeply rooted yearning for freedom and deliverance, and expresses this yearning through love, anger, hope, and commitment. How did the CD community express their yearning in terms of social relations, legal ordinances, and social structure?

After examining the unique responses of the CD community, we will examine them as a sect, to see if they display the characteristics commonly attributed to a religious sect. The CD community functions in the social role of the prophet, and expresses utopic values; but are they a sect? They are unique, but are they common? The CD community will not only be compared with the ideal-type of a

sect, but also with the models of sub-types developed by various sociologists. Finally, they will be compared to the early Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, to see if any commonalities exist with a specific example of a sectarian movement.

Before we continue to the body of the study, it would be useful to repeat a number of salient points. First, religion, however spiritual it seems, has a social impact which must be accounted for. The other side of the equation must also be preserved: religion cannot be understood simply as a reflection of social situations. Second, sociological models "are useful in so far as they have heuristic value, that is, in so far as they serve to illumine the unique phenomenon the researcher is studying."[51] The Damascus Document cannot be sacrificed to the generalities and commonalities of a sociological method to the detriment of understanding the text itself. Third, though this study is called a social description, it engages the necessary models for sociological interpretation. Gager claims that the distinction is more imagined than real, for "one cannot proceed without the other. Explanations without description is vacuous. Description without implicit theory is impossible."[52] Finally, I agree with Gregory Baum's understanding of religion and its relation to social reality:

> I do not wish to encourage an imagination that regards alienation as anthropologically neces-

> sary. I prefer to analyze the social process from the viewpoint that freedom is man's promised destiny.[53]

It is this freedom with which we are ultimately concerned.

Emerging from this study will be, it is hoped, some understanding of both what is typical and general and what is individual and unique about the Damascus community. The marginality of the Damascus community places them on the fringes of religious experience, and demands explanations as to why they are even worth knowing. Exiled, by others or themselves, in an unforgiving desert, their cause is buried and their influence forgotten. Yet such reasoning overlooks the reality of religious experience, both then and now.

The religious experience, at its core, speaks of the centrality of hope, commitment, and love. A sociological reconstruction should not distract the reader from the focus, the irreducible core, of this study. If the Damascus Document represents a community of marginal members of society, then there is continued significance in what these "losers" have to say. For when all is said and done, when they are allowed to speak through their text, the voice that we hear will allow us to redefine what it means to be a "loser" or a "winner" in terms of religious experience.

CHAPTER ONE

The Method and the Problem

There are no Qumran documents that can properly be classified as historical.[54] Though the CD contains historiographal evidence, it is not an historical text. As Geza Vermes acknowledges, this makes the reconstruction of Qumran origins difficult. The lack of history proper, at least from a modern perspective, also places the CD in a long and noble Israelite literary tradition.[55]

The ancient Israelites' concern with history was not of exhaustive, factual research, but with the selection of facts and occurrences which seemed relevant to and had the ability to reveal God's worldly order to man. Events were recorded in relation to their presumed significance for the community.[56] It may justifiably be presumed that the author of the CD was not unconcerned with historical events, but rather more concerned with the religious significance of these events, specifically in how they affected his community.

If historical events are referred to in the CD, at least in cryptic form, then it is with some confidence that

the historiographal writings of the CD may be seen to have some direct bearing on the community and its origins. And though it is the religious, not social, significance which the author intends to relate, much of social import remains in the text. For if the text relates only those events which directly affected the community, then the social forces which lie behind the events may be pinpointed and their relation to the community confirmed.

For the purposes of a sociological reconstruction, precise factual data is to be considered ideal, but what is available should not be considered unsubstantial or without significance. What the text gives us should not simply be discarded. If there is social significance in the theological and exegetical concerns of the author of the CD, how is this significance extracted? The extraction of socially relevant data rests initially on the data in general having historical importance. In a general sense, this has been shown to be likely. If the historical nature of the data can be more specifically shown, the socially relevant material may be located in the text.

The world, according to the sociology of knowledge, is at least partially socially constructed and is maintained through language and symbol. This being the case, the

production of language takes into account the relevant social forces during the course of its production. Language is capable of becoming the objective repository of social meaning and experience.[57] Even theological language is not devoid of social concerns, it may carry the reality of social experience. The questions remain: how does one move between language and social reality? and which social realities are to be related to the text in question?

The dating of the text is of utmost importance for the determination of the social realities significant to the community of the CD. Accurate dating of the text, utilizing traditional textual criticism as well as archeological evidence, allows the community to be placed in an historical time and place. When the time and place are determined, the affective social forces and events of that historical period can be delineated. A dialogue between what is known to be socially relevant and the text may then ensue. The dialogue relates textual data which contains historical or chronological information to the external, social evidence. If a point of intersection can be found, it may serve as a starting point for the examination of the origins of the Damascus community.

Before we attempt to date the CD, it is necessary to deal briefly with the supposed homogeneity of the Qumran documents. Hartmut Stegemann has found that while the

communities of CD and Qumran are related, they are not to be considered identical.[58] Such a conclusion allows the discreteness of the CD to remain an important issue in a textual study, but also accepts the close relationship between the Qumran documents and the CD. The closeness or exactness of the relationship will not be examined, but where general Qumran studies can shed light on the specific problem of the CD without infringing upon or diminishing its unique character, these will be utilized. The exact nature of the relationship may never be known, but it seems obvious that a relationship did exist; nevertheless, a cautionary approach will be maintained in the use of any Qumran data or evidence.

The Dating

E. Weisenberg notes that there is a nebulous atmosphere which pervades the CD and that the characters contained therein are vague and indistinct.[59] Certainty is elusive at the best of times, and the dating of an historical document does not present us with a "best of" case, but one either quits the chase or pushes on forward. There are two general theories as to the date of the origination of the CD community, with personal idiosyncracies abounding. The vast majority of scholars have placed the formation of the community of CD in the second century B.C.E., but there are a number of scholars who have chosen a sixth century B.C.E.

date. It is to the dissenting voices that our attention will first be turned.

The views of Isaac Rabinowitz and P. R. Davies will be examined. It was Rabinowitz, says Davies, who "broke a spell" in Qumran studies when his paper first appeared in 1954.[60] By this time, scholars had identified the CD sectarians with the Essenes, located them in Qumran, and the issue had been more or less laid to rest. Rabinowitz questioned the prevailing conclusions and led others to also. E. Weisenberg and R. North were two of those who immediately grasped certain of Rabinowitz's conclusions and continued on generally in his direction.[61] Over the years others have followed, but the most articulate and up to date spokesman for a sixth century B.C.E. dating is P. R. Davies. In his The Damascus Covenant, Davies argues strongly for the origination of the community of CD in the Exilic period. Others have come after and before, but none represent the dissenting voices as clearly as these two.

Rabinowitz, in his spell-breaking article, argues that the initial, and most significant, chronological data found in the CD has been misinterpreted. The reference to "the epoch of wrath, three hundred and ninety years after 'He had given them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon'" (I,5-7), depends on the mistranslation of a single ל . The key word is לתיתו and Rabinowitz takes issue with

the translation of the ל as "after." As a result, Rabinowitz does not translate the pericope as 390 years "after" Israel was given to Nebuchadnezzar, but as 390 years of wrath "culminating" in Israel being given into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar. Rabinowitz claims that the ל cannot have the temporal meaning of "after" in the CD or any other Qumran document.[62]

As a result, the 390 years is a reference to a period which ends when the Babylonian exile begins. Rabinowitz even calculates the actual years of iniquity from the figure located in Ezekiel 4:5. References to Damascus are symbolic references to Babylon and not to be accorded any real significance. A Damascus migration-sojourn in the second century B.C.E. is considered to be without support in the text. This leaves the interpreter with the understanding that "390" and "Damascus" are references to past scriptural history and not to be used in determining the veracity of the internal textual evidence.

Rabinowitz believes his work on the CD will result in "a considerable alleviation of the task of scholarship," because now "this work's place in the sequence of extra-biblical DSS texts, the Jewish group to whom the author(s) belonged, and its date and locale of composition can be located free of these chronological concerns."[63] Yet, what work has Rabinowitz done exactly? What spell did he break?

He considers the CD a Qumran document, he simply rejects the chronological data on a grammatical point, and reinterprets "Damascus" as a byproduct of this research. An interesting point arises: he does not object to the dating of the document in the second century B.C.E., he simply doubts the validity of the chronological data used for the dating. According to Rabinowitz then, the community of CD did not arise in Exile, the CD simply refers to it. The community of CD, though, is no closer to being found.

Far more satisfying and thorough is the work of P. R. Davies.[64] Whereas Rabinowitz treats the chronological data as unrelated to the community of CD, Davies believes that the community was actually formed while in Exile. Davies interprets the chronological data in much the same way as Rabinowitz does, but Davies grants it historical import. The document known as the CD is a Qumranic recension of a document written during the Babylonian captivity. The community of CD was the seed from which the Qumran community arose.

Davies sees the CD as based on a coherent text written during the Babylonian captivity. The document was an Israelite document in a general sense, not the product of sectarians. The sectarian nature of the CD only took shape with the addition of secondary material from Qumran. Davies discerns three different layers of material in his inter-

pretation of the CD, but the Qumran community produced the Laws and also various sections of the Admonition. The sections of the Admonition produced at Qumran include:

(1) allusions to an individual opponent of the Qumran community;

(2) the origins of a Qumran community heilsgeschichte;

(3) warnings originally uttered in respect of outsiders now redirected towards members of the Qumran community;

(4) hostile references to the Temple.[65]

Davies believes that most of the Admonition betrays a strong Exilic ideology, though, and so is willing to place it there historically.

As far as Davies is concerned, the chronological data of I,5-7 is to be considered secondary, that is, as a Qumran recension, on metrical grounds. The addition of 390 years represents a "telescoping of the timespan of the original text into more recent history."[66] In all cases, the historical summaries and evidence of the Admonition point directly tc a sixth century B.C.E. date.

Davies, for all his scholarly erudition and encyclopaedic marshalling of the evidence, does not argue convincingly for his historical construction. He muddies, rather than clears, the water. He argues for an Exilic origin for both the community and text, a Qumranic recension of this text, and a community at Qumran growing from this

exilic community. Yet, he raises more questions than are answered in the course of his reconstruction.

The Exilic origin of the text is arrived at because of the strong Exilic ideology evinced in the text and the fact that each historical summary seems to point towards the Babylonian captivity. Davies seems to misunderstand the sectarian view of history, namely, that an historical connection is not important if a "situational" connection can be made. If the community of CD sees itself as an exiled community whether or not they are historically linked to any other "exiled" remnant is unimportant; they will rewrite history to suit their own unique and narrow perspective. The sect will make history "work" for them.

There is also the question of the text as Qumranic recension. The text is acknowledged to be a part of the Qumran corpus, but only those parts of the text which entail a unique, sectarian view are products of the Qumran community. This is like saying that Old Man and The Sea is Hemingway's but if you strike those passages that are strictly Hemingway, it is much like any other book. There is no reason to dig for additional layers, however, when the text can be located clearly within the 2nd century B.C.E.

It is what Davies classifies as "secondary" that is the truly significant material. He is making separations where none need to be made. The text stands as a coherent whole,

not as a product of Babylonian captivity, but of a second century B.C.E. sect. Where the text can be whole, let it be whole. The claim that secondary additions have been made to a text by a sect begs the question, why? The text, according to Davies, was not initially sectarian, but only became such with the additional material. Why would the community not write a new document?

According to Davies, the community in possession of the CD is also a product of the Exile. Why were they still a separate community? Did they arise in Babylon or elsewhere? When did they arrive in Israel? Why did they go to Qumran? Davies does not adequately answer these questions. But he does suppose that an Exilic community, in fact, made its way to Israel, and harbouring no ill-will against the nation in general, remained intact. At some point, this community came into conflict with someone or somebody and retreated in exile to Qumran. After this, revisions were made to an Exilic document of theirs which previously was not sectarian in nature, and a new community arose.

There is not evidence, textual or otherwise, to suggest that an Exilic community preceded the CD community. Davies does not demonstrate its existence, or supply reasons for its continuing existence in Palestine, in any way at all. Yet, if a Qumran community is posited, without an Exilic community preceding it, Davies understanding of the text

makes sense. What Davies classifies as "secondary" material tells us why the CD community originated and how they lived; the "primary" material tells us of their own understanding of their role in Israel's history. There is no reason to suspect that the CD allusion to 390 years is an actual historical reference to the community's own past. The CD community has not made a literal linking with their nascent community, but rather a symbolic link with Israel's salvation history.

Davies wants everything: an Exilic community and text and a Qumran community and text. The easiest solution is not being adopted. This is admirable if the easiest solution is not the best, but in the case of the CD, it is. The community of CD arose in the second century B.C.E.; the text is a product of this community. Any other text or community is not evidenced in the CD.

Since Solomon Schecter's editio princepts, it has been widely accepted that the CD is to be rooted historically in the second century B.C.E. Generally, it considers the "age of wrath" to be the Hellenistic crisis, the "root from planting" an offshoot of the Hasidim, and the "wicked priest," Jonathan.[67] These conclusions, garnered from extra-biblical literature, archaeological evidence, and the CD, are those accepted by the vast majority of Qumran scholars. A partial list of those adhering to the general outline of

this theory is impressive: F. Cross, J. Murphy-O'Connor, H. Stegemann, G. Jeremias, J. Starcky, M. Hengel, and J. T. Milik.[68] To list all of their reasons in depth for their dating is beyond the scope of this study, but a quick review is in order.

First, the document was located in Qumran and shows marked similarities with the other Qumran materials. While this is not cause to identify the CD as a product of the Qumran community, it does allow provisional historical placement of the text.[69] The CD was in the library of Qumran and R. De Vaux has favoured a period bounded by a second century B.C.E. to 68 C.E. as the terminus pro quem and terminus ad quem of the settlement.[70]

Secondly, the historical data seems rather worth pursuing, and not in the desultory tone adopted by Davies. Perhaps 390 years is not meant in a literal sense, but it does have historical significance. Its symbolic relation to Ezekiel 4:5 has been established, but its historical relevance is not nullified. The author of the CD is "telescoping" history, trying to place his community in a situational context conducive to his interpretation of what his community is undergoing. If his math is poor, I am willing to accept this, because the author's concern is not with historical accuracy but religious veracity. Generally, the

dating of 390 years from Israel's captivity places the community of the CD in the Hellenistic/Maccabean period.

Thirdly, the "age of wrath" must be considered, then, as the Hellenistic crisis and Maccabean revolt, for no other period in the time frame caused such a social and religious upheaval and rending of the Palestinian cultural fabric. Apart from this, the "age of wrath" in many extra-biblical texts refers to the Hellenistic crisis.

Thus, the most probable date locates the CD in the second century B.C.E. A close reading of the evidence does not allow for another date. As well, the date makes excellent sociological sense, borne out by the following study. The Hellenistic crisis and the Maccabean revolt reflect a world groaning in transition and change, and it was into this world of conflict and dissensus that the community of the CD was born.

The Origins of the Community

The text which will be followed is Chaim Rabin's critical edition.[71] Rabin divides the document into two sections, namely, the "Admonition" and the "Laws." Included in the "Admonition," which begins with I,1 and ends with VIII,21, is MS.B, which is numbered XIX and XX. Rabin conflates MS.B. with sections VII,5 to VII,21 of MS.A. due to their many similarities. This compromise seems to be a wholly unsatisfactory compromise due to their many dif-

ferences. Far more satisfying is Davies' decision to allow MS.B. to stand alone. As a result, Davies' translation of MS.B., which he labels "the New Covenant," and MS.A. will be consulted at times; Rabin's conflation makes the choice to consult MS.B. (or MS.A.) as a discrete source nearly impossible.[72]

The second section, the "Laws," which deals with the structure and regulations of the community, runs from IX,1 to XVI,19. The search for the foundational social forces will be confined to the "Admonition." The "Laws" remains, for the time being, beyond our interests.

This textual survey seeks to answer the question, what was the social event, or events, and the social forces contained or unleashed therein, which gave impetus to the formation and subsequent withdrawal of the community of CD? There are other questions as well which must be asked and answered before, or while, the search for social forces goes on. These are: Was there a seminal community from which the CD community grew? Is there any indication of a split within a party or group? Does the text bear witness to factional infighting? Can their opponents, if any, be identified? And why, finally, did the CD community go into exile? Certain starting points are, of course, suggested by the historical time and place. This is a period fraught with foreign oppressors, internal factions, and increasing

Messianic fervor. The second century B.C.E. is a time of constant war and revolt, of never-ending conflict among countrymen. Our dialogue between text and history begins.

I,1, - I,12

The "Admonition" begins by issuing a call to the righteous to "consider the works of God" (I,1-2). For those who forsake God's righteousness, He will execute judgement by withdrawing from His sanctuary and giving them to the sword (I,2-4). This warning refers to a specific event, because during this time of apostasy God remembers "the covenant of the forefathers" and allows a remnant of Israel to be saved (I,4-5).

This remnant of Israel and Aaron is a "root" which is to "possess" Israel (I,7-8). The root is planted in the "epoch of wrath," 390 years following the commencement of the Babylonian exile (I,6-7). The remnant, or root, is not saved as a result of their goodness, but because they seek goodness (I,9-10). As a result, God gave them a "teacher of righteousness," after twenty years of groping, to show the remnant the way and make known the wages of the "congregation of the faithless" (I,11-12).

This passage is perhaps the most significant in laying a foundation for a sociological reconstruction. As previously discussed, the figure of 390 years is not to be taken literally, but neither is it merely symbolic. This figure

is meant to denote "real" time, as well as conveying the symbolism of Ezekiel 4:5. The figure, if not accurate, does place the origin of the community in or near the time of the Hellenistic crisis and the Maccabean revolt, as J. T. Milik says.[73]

The first problem concerns the identification of those who sinned in forsaking God. If we grant that the document is historically rooted in second century B.C.E., the most likely and logical reference is to the Hellenistic crisis, the time of Antiochus Epiphanes and the destruction and desecration of the Temple. The epoch of wrath is properly identified as the prolonged period of Hellenization, culminating in the Temple desecration.

The remnant which God maintains are those, it is implied, who remained righteous when the rest of Israel went astray. This "root" of Israel and Aaron are the Hasidim, the devout Jews who opposed Epiphanes and the program of the Hellenizing Jews. These Hasidim "grope their way for twenty years." The twenty years, if accepted as expressing "real" time, takes the Hasidim from the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes to the installment of Jonathan the Maccabee as High Priest. The twenty year span covers this period almost exactly. What did the "groping" consist of?

The Hasidim were being slaughtered for ten years prior to the Maccabean revolt, but though the Maccabees often

routed the Syrian forces between 165 B.C.E. and 152 B.C.E., their power was not consolidated until Jonathan, with the blessing of the Syrian forces, became High Priest. The groping, then, is most likely the period of Hasidic resistance and Maccabean revolt between Antiochus Epiphanes and Jonathan Maccabee.

At this point, God raises a "teacher of righteousness" to make known what would happen to the "congregation of the faithless." Why is the teacher raised now? The power of the Hasmonean dynasty has been consolidated, the Hellenizers are no longer an issue, and political calm has returned. Does not the groping end with Jonathan's appointment? If the congregation of the faithless are the Hellenizers, their fate has already been sealed.

The congregation of the faithless may not be Hellenizers. A teacher of righteousness was not necessary to instruct the people of Israel that this was not the way. A clue as to who they are may be found in the word בוגדים, which Rabin translates as faithless. However, Davies, in an interesting twist, translates בוגדים as traitors.[74] The traitors cannot be Hellenizers, since the latter are beyond salvation and their betrayal is no longer noteworthy. The traitors must be those who held the truth and betrayed it. The בוגדים are those Hasidim who sought the way, warred for the way, knew the way, and, in the interests of politi-

cal expediency, rejected the way. The teacher of righteousness, the leader of the Hasidim who became the community of CD, is leading the opposition against a congregation of traitors, or other Hasidim. The groping ends with a split between the Hasidim.

This invites the question as to why the marriage would dissolve now. In what way were the other Hasidim traitors? Now we enter the realm of speculation. The betrayal occurs in a relative state of calm, since the only social event of note is the installation of Jonathan to the High Priesthood. This may not be as innocuous as it first appears; his assent must be viewed from the radical vantage of the CD sectarians. The Hasidim rose initially to protest the attacks being waged on their religious legacy. At a later date, they were joined by the Maccabees who physically protested the foreign oppression and the attempt to destroy Israel's religious heritage. After years of constant battling to protect the purity of their faith, the most committed of the Hasidim were not able to accept any half-measures.

Jonathan's assent to the High Priesthood must be seen, through their eyes, as a half-measure. Jonathan was not, by tradition, entitled to the High Priesthood. Within the Hasidim worthy candidates must have existed, and one may well have been a "teacher of righteousness." While Jona-

than's rise to the High Priesthood may seem like a small price to pay for undisturbed religious observance, if it is not true observance, of what value is it? After the years of turmoil, to have the Maccabees make a pact with the enemy, and find support among some Hasidim, must have been the ultimate betrayal. This speculative venture, as numerous scholars have shown over the years, is well worth pursuing.

I,13 - II,1

After this passage, it is found that they, the faithless or traitors, are those that "backslide from the way" (I,13). It is a "man of scoffing" who arises to lead the faithless astray (I,14-15). This straying consists of turning "from the pathways of righteousness" in general, and of "removing the landmark which the forefathers had set up in their inheritance" in particular (I,15-17). For this, they earn the "curses of the covenant" and destruction (I,17-18). These people have interpreted with "smooth things," chose "delusions" and "the fair neck," justified the wicked and condemned the just, and caused others to transgress the covenant" (I,18-20). Those who walked in the righteous way they hated and persecuted, so that God's anger was aroused "against their congregation" (I,21-II,1).

That the faithless, or traitors, are those that backslide from the way appears to justify the earlier identifi-

cation of them as a faction of the Hasidim. To backslide is to reject what was once embraced. The leader of this Hasidic faction is the "man of scoffing"; he is not to be identified as the "wicked Priest" (Jonathan), but as the one who gathers the Hasidim behind the "Wicked Priest."

The Hasidic faction are those that have turned from righteousness by removing the landmark of the forefathers. A landmark is a property boundary-stone marking out traditional and ancient territory.[75] The removal of the landmark stone is tantamount to the theft of an ancient inheritance. It seems clear that this is meant to be interpreted metaphorically, but what is the ancient inheritance? The twin pillars of Judaism are Torah and Temple, and the answer would seem to lie with one of these two.

At this point it is difficult, or impossible, to choose one or the other with certainty. The CD is scathing in its assessment of Israel's adherence to the way of God as revealed in the Torah, as the passage under consideration begins to make evident. However, the Temple and its treatment at the hands of the rest of Israel finds no favour in the eyes of the CD community. The Temple, the current Temple apostasy, are pivotal and central concerns of the CD. To jump ahead a bit, it is the centrality of the Temple in the text of the CD that begins to weight the choice of the "removed landmark" in favour of Temple practice, or

interpretation of Temple law. Again, this choice is not due to the positive light the nation's adherence to Torah is cast in, but to the extremely negative light cast upon the nation's Temple adherence. The Temple dominates the text.

There are other, practical, considerations to weigh. The text seems to report a deliberate action, and singular action, not a continuing one, which robbed the nation of an ancient inheritance in one fell swoop. This action, it has been argued, was carried out by a small group which had the ability to remove an ancient inheritance. If the CD community designates itself as the "Sons of Zadok," and considers itself a priestly community in opposition to this group, the removal of an ancient landmark probably relates to the Temple and Temple practice. While a group of people is unlikely to remove proper observance of the Torah in a single act, however such an action could be accomplished, it is likely that Temple practice could be altered. For if a group interpret the Torah improperly, its immediate affect may be minimal or not apparent; if Temple practice was altered, the affect would be immediately and strongly felt. At this point, the suggestion can simply be made that the removal of an ancient inheritance involves either general Temple desecration, or the scrapping of proper priestly succession within the Temple cult. At this point, the text does not justify a leap of faith one way or the other.

Whatever the removal entails in specific, it earns its perpetrators "the curses of His covenant" and a violent end. This pay-off is their fateful reward for leading others astray and for choosing "smooth things," "delusions," and the "fair neck." They have chosen the easy way. Instead of supporting the righteous cause, they have removed the landmark and aligned themself with the betrayers to the cause. They have not only turned their back on the righteous community, but also begun persecuting them.

The final section of the passage hearkens back to I,12, where the "congregation of traitors" was seen to indicate a Hasidic faction which arose in opposition to the CD community. While previously we were concerned with the sense of בוגדים, now our attention turns to עדת. The problem, though minor, concerns the sense of "congregation." W. L. Holladay's Lexicon translates it as "the cultic congregation of Israel," but it may also have the sense of an assemblage, a gathering, or a company of people gathered around a prominent person.[76] The עדת in II,1 clearly signifies a group of men gathered around the "man of scoffing."

III,10 - IV,12

The community and its opponents have been tentatively identified. The issue which caused the initial dissension may concern proper succession to the High Priesthood and perhaps other Temple desecration.

After God pardons the new covenantors, he makes for them a "sure house" in Israel unlike any before it (III, 19). Those who adhere to it are destined for eternal life (III,20-21). Those who have held fast to it are the priests, the Levites, and the Sons of Zadok who kept charge of the sanctuary "when the children of Israel strayed" (IV, 1). Only those priests who remained righteous among the unrighteous, "they that turned (from impiety)," will be able to offer sacrifices at the sanctuary (IV,2-3). The priests are those that left Israel, the Levites are those who joined them, and the Sons of Zadok are the eschatological remnant (IV,4-5).

An exact statement of their names, the epoch of their existence, the number of their troubles, their years in exile, and a statement of their works is promised (IV,5-6). These are the "men of perfect holiness" whom God loved, and showed His love by justifying them and condemning the wicked (IV,7). For all those who follow, or join, with the righteous, God will make conciliation (IV,8-10). The time is short, however, because when the present epoch is complete, there will be no more joining with the House of Judah (IV,11-12).

The phrase of most interest is "sure house." Davies believes that "sure house" is a reference to I Sam. 2:35; 25, 28 and I Kings 11:38.[77] The "sure house" in these

passages denotes a priestly dynasty, "a dynasty (which) will enjoy the exclusive privilege of serving God in the Temple."[78] A "sure house," then, is the priestly dynasty which has a proper claim to the Temple and the High Priesthood. In effect, the Temple is rightly theirs because only they can rightly serve in it.

According to this passage in the CD, the sure house belongs to those priests and Levites who left Israel and its impiety. These are the priestly Hasidim of the CD community. Only these priests can properly enter the sanctuary to sacrifice and serve God, because only they remained true and did not stray. The High Priesthood and proper Temple worship rest with the CD. The major rift between the two factions of the Hasidim finds its root in the Temple.

The next line (IV,5-6) is basically a frustrating tease for the modern scholar. Where is the "exact statement" of names, troubles, years, and of the exile? If only such a statement were extant ...! Basically, though, the concluding paragraph outlines the fate of the righteous faction (CD Hasidim) and the wicked (all of Israel). The way is still open to accept the truth, but soon this will no longer be possible.

IV,13 - V,11

There is one point of interest in this passage for our present purposes. In IV,17, the three nets of Belial are

listed: whoredom, wealth; and conveying uncleanness to the Temple. The last "net" is of significance here. The manner in which the priests convey uncleanness is by entering the Temple after sleeping with a menstruating woman (V,6-7). Davies doubts the importance of this reference, claiming it is slim reason to reject the Temple.[79]

Perhaps taken alone this would be slim reason to reject current Temple practice, but as has been shown, it is not the only reason. In the context of the CD, it becomes one more reason and conveys the general disregard with which Israel's legacy is treated. From the High Priesthood down to the simplest of cleanliness injunctions, the Temple is in a state of disarray. Also, the inclusion of this minor desecration, if any can be classified as such, points to its reality. If a group is to drum up a charge of Temple desecration, this is hardly the most outrageous example.

V,19-21

Who are the desecrators of the Temple found in V,6-7? They are reviled in no uncertain terms (V,12-18) as those who lead Israel astray. They speak against God and are called "the removers of the boundary" (V,20-21). Is the "boundary" shorthand for the landmark boundary spoken of in I,16-17? If so, the desecrators of the Temple, as suspected, are one and the same with those who have ascended to the High Priesthood improperly.

VI,3-6

Those raised in opposition to the "removers of the boundary" are those whom God raised as "men of wisdom" and "men of understanding" (VI,1-3). These men are those who "turned from impiety of Israel" and went into exile (VI, 5-6). The terminology of VI,5-6 is the same as that in IV, 2-3. As we know, those who turned from the impiety of Israel are the rightful heirs to the Temple and the holders of the Priestly dynasty.

VI,12-19

This passage contains the most forthright condemnation of contemporary Temple practice. To kindle the altar in vain, it begins, is to "become such as shut the door" to God (VI,12-13). Only those not fulfilling the "words" of the covenant will kindle the altar in vain and turn from God (VI,12-15). The altar can be kindled righteously, but only if care is taken to do so according to the "Law for the epoch of wickedness" (VI,14). The CD community must stay apart from the "children of the pit," and from unclean wealth acquired from the sanctuary by numerous devious means, and must distinguish between Holy and common and between clean and unclean (VI,15 - VII,4).

This provides a veritable litany of conditions that must be met before the Temple can be used. The question is,

can the Temple, for all the rhetoric, be used in any practical sense? Theoretically, the Temple is not off limits to the forerunners of the CD community, but for all practical purposes use of the Temple is nearly impossible. The stringent guidelines render the Temple out of bounds.

How can the CD sectarians avoid the "children of the pit" when the latter control the Temple? How can they distinguish between clean and unclean, Holy and common, when the Temple priests are unable or unwilling to? The Temple as institution is not rejected, but current practice is and so, as a result, must the Temple be. The Temple which is their proper inheritance must be avoided.

VII,10-21

The community of CD had an answer. When Ephraim left Judah, Ephraim ruled over Judah (VII, 12). Those that were not killed, but held fast to God, escaped to "the land of the North" (VII,13-14). Exiled with them were "the sikkuth of your King," the "kiyyun of your images," and "the star of your God from My tent to Damascus" (VII,15). The sikkuth is the books of law, the kiyyun is the books of the prophets, while the star is the interpreter of the Law (VII,16-19).

Ephraim and Judah are cryptographic designations for the two factions of the Hasidim.[80] The House of Judah represents the forerunners of the CD sectarians. As the text explains, the Law and its proper interpretation rests

with the exiled House of Judah. The Law has been sent from God's "tent" to Damascus.[81] The "tent," of course, is the Temple.

If the Law of the Temple rests in exile, then the Temple is devoid of meaning without the CD sectarians. What this means for the "true" heirs of the Temple inheritance is that, in spirit, the Temple itself rests in exile with the CD community. The problem is solved: the Temple is not absent, but present in their midst.

A reconstruction has been hinted at throughout our discussion of the dating and the exegesis, but now its building begins in earnest. Prior to the initial revolt by Mattathias and his sons, there was in Israel an extended period of Hellenization. Both the Syrian occupation forces and Jewish Hellenizers promulgated the program of Hellenization among the Israelite nation. Victor Tchericover is correct when he asks that we see the uprising of the Maccabees in the historical perspective of prolonged unrest; it is equally correct to see the continuing developments in the same perspective of unrest.[82]

It is incorrect and misleading, though, to see the initial protest to the Hellenizing program in the Maccabean revolt. Before the Maccabees swung a sword in revolt, there was resistence to the Hellenization of Israel. This resistance, however futile, was carried out by the Hasidim. The

Hellenizers, under the patronage of Antiochus Epiphanes, believed that the remaining Jews would succumb easily to the attempt to destroy and deny them their religion. Epiphanes read his cards incorrectly when he desecrated the Temple, for resistance by the Hasidim was formed swiftly.

The Hasidim are historically shadowy figures. What brought them together appears to be no more, or less, than love for Israel and YHWH. The best hypothesis sees them as a group of devout, religious Jews, including both priests and laymen, joined to protect their religion. These are the forerunners of the community of CD and their opposition.

The Hasidim resisted the Hellenizing program alone for a period of about ten years. The Maccabees joined their cause only after witnessing the death of unarmed Hasidim on the Sabbath.[83] Whether they were joined in fact, or only in spirit, the Hasidim found an ally in the Maccabees. In the ensuing years, both parties remained true to the struggle for the faith, although the Maccabees did become more politicized as the revolt drew to an end.

The origins of the CD community, ironically, did not grow out of the revolt itself, but in its culmination. The culmination of the revolt brought to an end the twenty year period of groping. The majority of Israelites favoured the Maccabean cause and an end to war. The Syrians, sensing the popular support of the Maccabees, withdrew their support

from the Hellenizers and threw it behind the Maccabees. For the Syrians, it simply saved them unnecessary conflict.

Part of their support for the Maccabees involved the installation of Jonathan as the High Priest. It is this seemingly innocuous act which caused a split between the Hasidim. One faction, led by the "teacher of righteousness," opposed this action; another faction, led by the "man of scoffing," supported it. The social forces which sent the sect to the desert find their origins in the fallout from this event.

That such a relative calm, after prolonged conflict, should underlie this split is not as contradictory or ironic as it may seem. A priestly Hasidic faction, which supported the Maccabees through bloodshed and turmoil against a common enemy, would have expected the culmination of the conflict to result in the restoration of the proper Temple cult, both in priestly succession and in Temple practice. Is this not what they were fighting for? To have the Maccabees, instead, turn to their oppressor for political expediency, to find a usurper placed upon the High Priest's seat, and to have a faction of their party support this action, must have seemed the ultimate betrayal.

To the forerunners of the CD, political calm and relatively proper Temple worship were not reasons to sell short the faith. The rightful priestly hierarchy found that its

allies, not enemies, had sold the faith short and had forfeited its position as heir to Israel's religious legacy. Nothing is as alienating as to be turned upon by those who were trusted.

The straying Hasidim, in league with the Maccabees, betrayed the goal for the easy way out. The forerunners of the CD community, in addition, witnessed further Temple desecration and were, in fact, victims of persecution. The forerunners of the CD were committed: no half measures would be good enough. The seeds of alienation had been sown. If they were unable to worship in the Temple, they would worship elsewhere.

Davies is correct, though, when he suggests that the CD community does not reject the Temple outright.[84] In fact, it is their dedication to and love of the Temple which leads to their self-imposed exile. The evidence of the CD suggests that the Temple was the seminal and pivotal institution in the group's ideology and subsequent formation. It was the abrogation of proper Temple succession and worship which caused the community to withdraw. Alienation arises in direct correlation to the degree of attachment a group feels.

If the CD community was to be holy as God was holy, it could not be in the Temple. To a group which in modern terminology may be classed as radicals, fanatics, or "true

believers," shaking hands with the enemy could not be imagined. Only adherence to the highest ideals and traditions of Israel could be supported. The years of fighting and infighting had steeled them, prepared them, and driven home the importance of fidelity to their Temple and religion.

Is the split then simply a religious, not social, dispute? The question does an injustice to the nature of religion and human reality. A religious dispute is never simply religious, it has a social dimension and social repercussions. The group's withdrawal to the desert was in part a response to the social realities of conflict, dissensus, and alienation, borne from war, internal factionalism, and religious disputes.

They withdrew in alienation and anger, but their lifestyle and its theological expression was a constant protest to the culture they had left behind. Their lifestyle was a critique of mainstream culture and religion. They possessed the way of righteousness and called for Israel to adhere to the way.

CHAPTER TWO

How did a group of Zadokite priests, and their followers, alienated from the Temple cult and the nation of Israel, respond to the forces of alienation and conflict? The simplicity of the question belies the complexity of the answer. The community's responses were many, and the attempt to list them with some semblance of order does an injustice to the nature of social response. Order, more often than not, is the product of an index, not of social reality.

To piece together a community's rise, with only the data at hand, is a revealing task. History, and historical documents, much to an historian's chagrin, do not present evidence on a line that may be traced from start to end. The CD does not invite one to plot cause and effect and bundle the results in a neat package. There is cause and there is effect, though, and the historian's task, social or otherwise, is to make sense of the evidence. While the result may not be the equivalent of holding a mirror up to reality, it may offer a sketched outline. What follows,

then, is a sketch of a community, rough in some places, even rougher in others, but with a picture clearly emerging.

We have indicated in the previous chapter, that the initial response of the CD community was withdrawal. The members chose not to take up arms in support of their claims of legitimacy, or to compromise their ideals; they chose to withdraw from the mainstream of Jewish life and form a new community. The CD community, marginalized and persecuted, relinquished their claim to the Temple priesthood and the cultic programme for the nation. They chose to isolate themselves physically from the nation of Israel.

How would they define themselves though? Unless their alienation and persecution could be interpreted in some meaningful and purposeful sense, there could be no community. They would make sense of their social situation, or like a tree cut from their root they would wither without sustenance. The terms of their self-definition are found scattered throughout the "Admonition."

The Chosen Community

Throughout the CD the community is intent on showing how they, not the nation of Israel, represent the chosen of God. In a unique method of interpretation, the community on the fringes of Israel becomes the embodiment of Israel. In the opening discourse of the "Admonition," God is said to

without way," a nation which turns from the "paths of righteousness" and which, as a result, will be delivered to destruction (I,14-17).

The wickedness of Israel is further outlined in IV,20-VI,1. While the implication of the passage is that there is an evil faction leading the nation astray, the whole nation is culpable for the sin of this faction through mere association with them. And the wickedness of Israel appears to be boundless. They are guilty of incest, polygamy, and defiling the sanctuary. They mock God's ordinances and turn a deaf ear to the counsel of God.

The theme is continued in VIII,1-12.[86] The "princes of Judah" are marked for destruction because they are rebellious, they are traitors, and they hate.[87] Instead of following the ways of God, they follow the ways of the nations. The "princes of Judah," the enemies of the CD community, and the nation as a whole, are guilty of a great litany of sins. The nation is judged and the nation is found wanting.

That the nation of Israel revels in sin is reason enough to separate from them, for mere association with them renders the righteous man unclean. There is more though. The nation not only engages in sin, it also persecutes those who seek righteousness (I,19-21). The people of Israel interpreted with "smooth things" and "delusions" and "looked

out for gaps and chose the fair neck" (I,19). The nation of Israel persecuted those who followed after God (I,20-21).

There is a clear allusion here to Isaiah 30:9-11, where Israel is recorded as saying to the true prophets in an evocative passage:

> Prophesy not to us what is right;
> speak to us of smooth things,
> prophesy illusions,
> leave the way, turn aside from the path,
> let us hear no more of the Holy
> One of Israel.

The nation the CD speaks of does not want to hear of God or righteousness; it wants to hear of the easy way. The faithful members of the CD community suffer persecution for their adherence to the way of God, but ultimately they know they will be vindicated for their forbearance. According to the CD, the sinful nation will be punished for their persecution of the community (II,21 - III,1).

The CD community's pain is not without meaning, and the sinners will not escape vengeance. The CD records that in the past the wicked have always been punished (I,4; II,18-21; III,1-2). The only difference between the sin of the past generations and the sin of the present generation is that the fast approaching punishment of the present generation will be greater, either in kind or degree.

For those who abhor righteousness, and therefore God, there will be "great wrath with fiery flames by all the angels of destruction against those who turn from the way

and abhor the ordinance, without remnant or survivor of them" (II,5-7). Those who have not held fast to God's covenant will be visited by the destruction of Belial (VIII,2). While the CD community will gain life, "those who are left shall be delivered to the sword when the Messiah of Aaron and Israel comes" (XIX,9-11).

This heightened sense of eschatology serves to make sense of the nation's sinfulness and the CD community's marginalization. Though the wicked enjoy the fruit of their sin now, power and prestige, their end will be fiery and swift. The righteous, now suffering, will gain the fruits of their election. There would be a restoration of old conditions, but with a new order and a new covenant. This new order, brought into being by a vindicating Messiah, the complete ruin of the wicked, and the fulfilment of Israel's election, would be the CD community (XX,9-13). It was this hope which acted as a salve for their wounds.

There was tension though between the CD community's self-understanding as the elect and the understanding that God could be chosen. Was redemption available to all? Forgiveness is available for a limited time only because destruction is imminent (IV,9-11). For those who turn to God and away from sin, He will make conciliation (II,4-5). Even those who turned from the way of the CD community in a few respects will be judged according to their hearts

(XX,22-24). The way to God is never closed according to the CD. So though God chooses the remnant (I,4) and hates the wicked, causing them to go astray (II,7-9), the wicked can choose redemption. Redemption, the way to God, is only available through the community.

This tension between choice and predestination E. P. Sanders rightly calls a sectarian problem.[88] The community made sense of their marginalized status by altering their understanding of "who" the elect are; but what of the availability of this status for all? As Sanders says, the belief in election serves to explain the existing state of affairs, but the belief that God may be chosen is the result of practical experience: people turn from evil. The nation of Israel can change.

What would be the programme of change for the nation? Clearly, if the CD defined itself as the chosen community, then they also knew, and practiced, the way of God. The programme of change was only available through the CD community. Their way was the true way because they had access to divine revelation. God revealed to the community "'hidden things' in which all Israel went astray" (III,13-14). He let them "hear (His voice), and they dug a well"; this well was the law of God (VI,2-4). These "hidden things," the law, were revealed to the "men of wisdom and understanding" in study sessions. In these sessions the

community recovered "the correct interpretation through inspired biblical exegesis."[89] Revelation was given to the CD community to divine the word of truth.

One further question concerns us, then, and that is the nature of these revelations. Is it old or new revelation? How can the nation be judged and punished on the basis of "hidden things"? As Sanders states:

> it would appear to be inaccurate to hold that the only reason for the establishment of a new covenant was that "the old one had been disregarded by the majority of the people," for the sectarian covenant contains new revelations.[90]

This understanding of the nature of revelation, however, was not shared by the CD community.

As Schiffman says, in the sect's view, God's revelation was unending; each generation would derive regulations for their own time.[91] They were not unearthing new revelation, but hidden or forgotten revelation.

> It is true that the sect believed the Torah was properly understood in the days of the rishonim, apparently before the onset of the Hellenistic period. But they laid no claim to a tradition from that period. On the contrary, they claimed that the tradition had been lost. Only they, with divine help, had succeeded in rediscovering the real meaning of scripture and only they lived in accord with it.[92]

The community was not calling the nation to a new way, but back to an old and hidden way.

Israel was regarded as culpable for violations of the nistarot (hidden laws), even though the community's inter-

pretations were kept within the community.[93] Besides the nation could not even remain true to the nigleh (revealed law), which they misinterpreted, flaunted, and abused. What this meant in practical terms was that salvation was available only through the community. Revelation was given to the community by God, and repentance would have to be sought within the community.

The community, in summary, defined itself as the chosen remnant, guardians of the Law and arbiters of the way of God. Though cast out and persecuted, they would claim victory at the eschaton. At this time their tormentors would be punished, and they would usher in the new order and grasp the prize of their salvation. This they would achieve because God had revealed the way to them, and only to them; Israel could find salvation only through the CD community.

What is important for this study, then, is the content of their response to alienation. If they are the chosen community, how do the chosen live? How did their beliefs change? And how did they structure their community?

The "Laws"

The "Laws" serve as the model of how the CD community functions. The CD community's programme for the nation is contained in the "Laws." And law is able to reveal the community to us:

> The legal materials from the Dead Sea caves also serve as an excellent source for an understanding of several aspects of the communal structure and way of life of the sect, as the daily life of the sectarian and of the sect as a whole was regulated closely by the texts of the group. The legal texts of any society open a window into its daily life unavailable elsewhere. From law we learn social history, and that is the case with the Qumran material.[94]

So while the CD community revolved around the "Laws," "the entire thrust of the Admonition" being the correct observance of them,[95] for our purposes the "Laws" serve to tell us how the community responded in a new social situation to what it meant to be Israel and what it meant to be holy.

The "Laws" have been said to contain two types of law: Halakhic and organizational. Here, however, no distinction in importance will be made between Halakhah, the uniquely Jewish religious, civil, and criminal law, and sectarian organizational regulations. No distinction will be made because we have no reason to doubt that they both were derived by the community, or said to be derived, in the same manner, namely, inspired biblical exegesis. Though Schiffman makes a distinction between the two types, it cannot be maintained. Even he admits that the sect may not have seen organizational regulations as different in kind: "Of course these nonscriptural laws were ultimately intended to fulfill the ideals which the sect perceived inherent in the Bible."[96] To the community the law was the law.

Secondly, for a sociological study, the distinction between Halakhah, religious, civil, and criminal law, and organizational regulations, becomes a chicken and egg proposition. Which came first? Both are determined by social reality, and each determines the other. So do organizational regulations first affect Halakhah? Or does Halakhah first affect organizational regulations? The answer is redundant. What is significant is that both are mediated by social reality and both can reveal the community to us.

This understanding is derived from the sociology of knowledge. When social circumstances change, so, often, do belief and action. Belief is socially constructed. Yet, the belief structure underlying the "Laws" should find its roots in the ideals and institutions of Israel. We have already seen that the CD community understand themselves to be the chosen of Israel. How do they interpret the Halakhah of the Torah in light of their new situation? What did it mean to be holy without access to the Temple? How did they interpret fidelity to the twin pillars of Judaism, Torah and Temple, when they lived on the fringes of Israel and no longer had access to the cultic centre?

How the community reinterpreted fidelity to Israel will influence the community's structure. The community is the attempt to put into practice the Halakhah of the "Laws." The relationship may be stated this way: social forces led

to withdrawal and construction of a new community. This social reality led to a re-evaluation of what it meant to be Israel, found in the self-definition of the community, but also in the reformulation of Halakhah. This re-evaluation of the ideals and institutions of Israel is reflected in the community structure as revealed to us in the organizational ordinances. The questions arise: how is the community structured? How does the formation of the community affect social relations both within and beyond the community? And, ultimately, we return to the question underlying them all: what is the content of their response, both organizational and Halakhic, as seen in the "Laws" to the alienation from the nation of Israel?

The sheer amount of legal material to be studied dictates that choice must be made. In order to avoid Cyril Rodd's claim that social theory makes its evidence fit, a suggestion of Jerome Murphy-O'Connor will be followed. Murphy-O'Connor believes that the list of precepts found in VI,11 - VII,4, which he calls the "Memorandum," refers to the community's most significant laws. He says that

> a memorandum of its very nature implies emphasis. Comparison of this particular memorandum with both the Holiness Code and the Legal section of the CD makes it clear that a selection of materials has been made. From this we can infer that the precepts chosen for inclusion were emphasized because they had a special relevance for the community to which the Memorandum was directed.

> They are, therefore, a series of clues to the situation of the community.[97]

It is these clues that a study of the "Laws" must seek.

The search, however, must be supplemented with additional clues. As noted earlier, no distinction is made between Halakhah and organizational regulations in terms of importance or significance. Since the "Memorandum" contains no organizational regulations, all those found in the text will be considered. The "Memorandum" will be divided into two categories on the basis of subject matter, and so with the addition of the organizational regulations, three categories will be distinguished: social relations; purity and sabbath regulations; and organizational regulations. The separation facilitates study, but is not meant to imply a separation in importance or reality.

i. Social Relations

The precepts which deal with social relations are as follows:

(1) Keep apart from the Sons of corruption;

(7) Let each man love his brother as himself;

(8) Take the hand of the poor, the needy, and the stranger;

(9) Let each man seek the well-being of his brother;

(10) Let no one act treacherously towards his relatives;

(11) Refrain from (lust) according to the ordinance;

(12) Let each man reprove his brother according to the commandment, and let no one bear a grudge from one day to the next.

Four of the precepts located under the heading social relations do not find further expansion in the CD legal code. This is not because they are judged to be unimportant; as Murphy-O'Connor has said, inclusion in the "Memorandum" is indicative of their importance to the community. Rather, it is because it is understood that their inclusion in the Holiness Code of Lev. 17-26 is sufficient and does not warrant expansion or reformulation. "In cases in which the sect regarded the Bible as self-sufficient, laws were not formulated in the sectarian codes."[98] These four precepts, seven, nine, ten, and eleven, all have a common link, namely, they deal with regulations among family or community members. What do they tell us about the community's situation?

The precepts ask that each man love his brother, seek the well-being of his brother, not act treacherously towards his relatives, and refrain from lust. Each of these precepts is concerned with internal, communal relations among CD community members. Does their inclusion in the "Memorandum" indicate strain among community, especially family, members in regard to social relations? Internal conflict was clearly present at some point (XIX,34-35; XX,10-13), although this does not indicate a breakdown, complete or otherwise, among community members. What it does indicate is an awareness of their social situation.

The inclusion of these four precepts, apart from their theological significance, was probably determined by a realistic assessment of the CD community. The CD acknowledges that members had previously left their community. The four precepts were a necessary reminder to guard against inevitable internal conflict. Among an isolated and separated community, internal relations were of utmost importance; beyond the community, there was nothing. Of course, the inclusion of these precepts has a negative message, that relationships among the community members were fragile and necessitated wariness. The positive message is that the community recognized the importance of brotherhood in an isolated community. The importance of smooth internal relations, of love among the community members, was not negligible, for if the outside world greeted the CD community with hostility and persecution, the warmth of the community was their only anchor.

It seems apparent that the CD community was also concerned that in every way they were a separate people. Unlike the rest of Israel, they would love their fellow man as God commanded. Israel could not even love their kinsmen, let alone anyone else. In VIII,5-7, the "princes of Judah" are portrayed as indulging in lust, unchastity, hatred of their neighbour, and hatred of their kinsmen. These charges are repeated in V,8-11. The nation is accused of violating

those precepts the CD community cherishes most highly. What the nation ignored, the precepts of God, the community adhered to.

So while the community had suffered internal dissension and conflict, this was not their uppermost concern. Had it been, it is likely that the community would have formulated unique, sectarian laws to deal with each specific problem. Of more concern was the requisite love a small, isolated brotherhood demanded to survive in the face of marginalization and hostility. After witnessing the conflict and dissension which wracked the nation, and from which they had fled, they were doubly determined to avoid similar problems following their withdrawal. Though the inclusion of precepts from the Holiness Code demands no lengthy apologia, it seems clear that, in light of their social situation, their desire for, and striving after, love and brotherhood was not only a theological virtue, but a necessary component of the CD community's programme if they were to survive.

Two of the remaining precepts are located both in the "Laws" and the Holiness Code. These are the eighth and the twelfth precepts. The twelfth precept deals with internal, social relations as well. In this case, the Holiness Code is not deemed to be sufficient in its explication of the law. The ordinances of Lev. 19:17-18 are reformulated in IX,2-8 of the CD.

The precept concerns bearing a grudge and reproving a neighbour. An accusation against a community member could not be made without "reproving before witnesses" (IX,3-4). The act of reproving could not be made in anger or to make the sinner appear contemptible (IX,4). If one who witnessed a sin kept his knowledge private, then allowed it to be told later in anger, the one who brought the accusation, not the accused, was sinning (IX,5-8).

The difference between the CD and the Holiness Code is not in sense, but in specification and depth. The "Laws" do not alter the meaning of the Holiness Code pericope, but expand upon it, thus granting it applicability in a given situation. It is this understanding which leads to the conclusion that these formulations were of some importance to the CD community, and spoke to real concerns and situations. This is not textbook law.

The act of reproving needed witnesses, and in IX,17-23 we see the stringency with which the bringing of testimony was regulated. If sin was witnessed, it was to be brought before the community without anger or vengeance, and, as is illustrated in IX,17-23, with more than one witness on more than one occasion. The point is that one man's word, which was more likely to be false or the product of personal animosity, was not sufficient. Honesty was the desired outcome. False charges could not be tolerated in an

isolated and insulated community, where animosity between two men could cause great tears in the social fabric. In a separated community, it was necessary to keep conflict to a minimum if the society was to function smoothly. As a result, the laying of charges was strictly delineated and the bearer of a grudge was regarded as a sinner.

Withholding information regarding a witnessed sin also made the observer guilty of sin. Observance of the law, and bringing sinners to justice, was of utmost importance; but equally important was how the law was observed and how the members of the community lived with each other. To repeat, the nature of the CD community's situation dictated that internal disagreements or grudges not be lorded over a fellow member, or used as a form of religious blackmail. The fragile social fabric would not bear the strain of petty, or other, conflict.

The second precept which also finds formulation within the CD legal code is the eighth precept, concerning charity. This set of ordinances, located in XIV,13-17, has to do with the poor and the weak, those who are unable to fend for themselves. The nature of communal charity was formalized, with two days wages, at the least, being given to the overseer and the judges to distribute. This amount is less than the tithe and it is not clear whether it supplemented the tithe or replaced it among the CD com-

munity. At any rate, the money which was collected would be given to the orphans, to the poor and needy, for burial expenses, for the homeless, for the redemption of a member taken prisoner, for women with no one to provide a dowry, and for women whom no one sought in marriage.

These, it seems, are not examples of textbook law, but laws which speak to real situations. For the most part, the situations that these ordinances speak to were situations which in all probability could, and did, arise. The one example which may not speak to a real situation concerns the redemption of a member taken prisoner. There is no indication that the persecution of the community extended to their place of exile, or that they were a warring community; however, their own perception of their environment, their having just fled a hostile one, may have led them to the conclusion that this was a situation that could at any time be real, and for which they must prepare.

The purpose of the laws is clear, though; the laws were to provide care for those who were unable to provide it for themselves. Those in their midst without means would be given means. This does not appear to be a reaction to a lack of charity among the community members, but a formalization of what was most important to them. In light of the many ordinances dealing with brotherhood among the community members, and in light of their separated status, the com-

munity's concentration on charity is understandable as well as necessary. They could not function as a community with poverty in their midst; their claims to brotherhood would be laughable. And their isolated location made them aware of who was in their midst. Physical nearness demanded that they respond to those who were in need of care. Charity was not only a virtue, but a necessity.

The final precept in this category, and the first in the "Memorandum," is somewhat different in tone than the previous six. It says simply, "keep apart from the sons of corruption." This precept does not have its specific root in the Holiness Code, and it is not found in specific formulation in the CD legal code. However, it is arguably the most significant of all the precepts.

It may, in fact, be at the root of the majority of the other precepts and the legal ordinances themselves. It concerns the quest for holiness, the overriding concern of the community. The "sons of corruption" are Israel. The "Admonition" took great pains to outline the sins of Israel, and to make clear that to approach the sin of Israel is to be culpable for it. To contact sin is to contract it. The attempt to cultivate holiness is foremost in the minds of the CD community. Since they are the chosen community, no good can come from fraternizing with the wicked.

To "keep apart from the sons of corruption" is in no need of expansion precisely because each purity law, each Sabbath law, and each regulation defining social relations set limits on external social relations. Throughout the "Admonition" the community was told how to remain apart. It is tempting to say that external social relations were non-existent, except that this not only seems impossible but the text of the CD hints otherwise.

The charity laws of XIV,13-17 ask for two days wages to be given to the community's coffers. Where did the members of the community work? A further question is raised by XII,19-23, wherein camp and city communities are distinguished. How did the members of the city communities remain apart from the "sons of corruption"? While the information is too scanty to warrant an answer, it appears that there was some participation, however undesired, in the life of the nation of Israel. We can only speculate on the extent of the participation, though, and the general thrust of the precept remains intact.

The call to separate is heard throughout the text of the CD; it is a given. While love, brotherhood, and charity are the order of the day within the community, beyond the community relations, clearly and simply, were not advised.[99] The community was set apart to stay apart. The community response, then, in terms of social relations was to stress

that which was clearly necessary for conflict-free relations within the community. Their social situation demanded that they respond with love and charity or face the disintegration of their community. By contrast, they were to avoid the "sons of corruption." By contrasting their most significant laws with the sins of the nation, they devised an apologia for remaining apart. Internally, they called for love; externally, they did not issue a call.

ii) Purity and Sabbath Regulations

The second set of precepts have to do with purity and Sabbath regulations:

(2) Refrain from the unclean wealth of wickedness, (namely), things vowed or consecrated ...;

(3) Make a distinction between the clean and unclean ...;

(4) Keep the sabbath day according to its rules;

(5) (Keep) the appointed feasts ...;

(6) Set aside the holy things according to their exact rules;

(13) Keep apart from all forms of uncleanness.

The second precept will be discussed first; it does not have a corresponding ordinance in the Holiness Code.

The second precept concerns proper Temple usage, and as with all things relating to the Temple in the CD, it raises many problems. The referent in the CD legal code is XVI,13-16. Further references in the CD concerned with proper Temple usage are found in IX,4, XI,17-18, and XII,1. Before

examining any of the laws just cited, it is necessary to return to the "Memorandum" and discuss both the prologue (VI,11-14) and the precept (VI,15-17). The discussion is required if the examination of the legal ordinances relating to Temple usage is to bear any fruit. The short passage VI,11-14 introduces the "Memorandum" and functions as an explanation for the necessity of listing the thirteen precepts. P.R. Davies calls it "that crucial and problematic passage."[100] The first question which arises from it is whether it allows community members any recourse to the Temple. If the answer is yes, the laws relating to the Temple are obviously necessary. If not, why are the Temple laws being listed in the CD? What is their function and purpose? The passage, as Davies says, is both crucial and problematic, and resolving its many problems now takes centre stage.

Two commentators' views will be discussed in depth, namely, those of P. R. Davies and Jerome Murphy-O'Connor. The passage, in the Hebrew, reads as follows:

כל אשר הובאו בברית לבלתי בוא אל המקדש להאיר מזבחו חנם
ויהיו מסגירי הדלת אשר אמר אל מי בכם יסגור דלתו ולא
תאירו מזבחי חנם אם לא ישמרו לעשות כפרוש התורה לקץ הרשע.

Davies has the first word.

Davies' method of dealing with the problems of the text is to excise them. He argues, quite correctly, that "the root of the difficulty is, I think, that the statement is

simply not grammatical."[101] Davies, then, makes it grammatical by arguing that the difficult or ungrammatical passages are "probably a Qumran gloss."[102] Beginning with וילהיו and ending with חנם , he cuts out the offending passage. His construction eliminates the half of an allusion to Mal. 1:10, that concerned with the "closers of the door." His translation allows for the CD community to use the Temple, provided they adhere to the following precepts. He admits that those sections he has excised "emanate from a community which had abandoned the Temple cult."[103]

His resolving of the issue depends on two presuppositions: the section he cuts out is the product of a Qumran gloss; and the CD community brought to Qumran a document which had taken shape elsewhere. The first supposition has not been adequately demonstrated. Because the section is problematic, and ungrammatical, does not mean it is a gloss. The fact that the allusion of the "closers of the door" is linked with those who will not "kindle fire upon my altar in vain" in Mal. 1:10, actually precludes it being a Qumran gloss. Perhaps most damning though, is that the first supposition rests on the last, and the last has previously been rejected.

Davies himself admits that, with the section he considers a gloss included, the passage seems to reflect a

community which has rejected the Temple cult. The translation which best renders the passage in English is Murphy-O'Connor's. Rabin's translation is nigh impossible to decipher, so in order to decipher whether and how the CD community rejected the Temple cult, Murphy-O'Connor's version will be consulted. His excellent discussion was published in "The Translation of Damascus Document VI,11-14."[104]

Murphy-O'Connor's greatest strength is his ability to synthesize the difficulties of the passage without rendering it incomprehensible or so tenuous as to be unbelievable. There is general agreement that the first line denies access to the covenant members who would "light His altar in vain." Is there, in the remainder of the passage, a condition which would allow covenant members use of the Temple? Davies argues that if they observe the thirteen precepts, the Temple is not off limits. Murphy-O'Connor believes that the covenant members are not to use the Temple, and that obedience to the precepts is not a precondition of Temple use, but a precondition of being a true "closer of the door."[105] To truly follow the way of God, that is, function as a "closer of the door," the CD community member must avoid the Temple and follow the law for the time of wickedness.[106]

He translates the passage as follows:

> All those who were persuaded to enter into an agreement not to enter the sanctuary to kindle his

> altar in vain, shall they be "closers of the door," as God said: "Who among you will close its door that they may not enter to kindle my altar in vain?", unless they shall be careful to act according to the exact interpretation of the Law for the duration of the time of wickedness.[107]

Although his sense of an additional covenant regarding the avoidance of the Temple should be rejected, this does not alter the sense of the translation, namely, that to be a closer of the door one must obey the law and avoid the Temple. This leaves us with the question, why did the following precept refer to Temple usage and why did the CD community formulate Temple law?

Regarding the precept, Murphy-O'Connor says "the quotations from Is. X,2 and Ps. XCIV,6 give the impression of a gloss designed to explain why the property of the Temple is 'unclean of wickedness'."[108] That is, it appears the precept is delineating an actual event or series of events which have made the Temple unclean. It does not simply state the general law, but also gives a specific instance of how the Temple has been, or is being, defiled. If the property of the Temple is unclean, the Temple, as is, is incapable of being clean. While the CD community, because of their allegiance to the Temple, continue to formulate law, it is all designed to keep the Temple off limits. The Temple is in the hands of the "sons of corruption." The Temple is never rejected, but it is unusable.

This does not mean that the laws dealing with the Temple are to be taken as theoretical, but nor does it mean that they are designed to allow the Temple to be used in the present. True, the laws deal with proper Temple usage and are directed at Temple misuse by community members. No one is to vow anything unlawfully acquired (XVI,13). The priest should not receive anything unlawfully acquired (XVI,14). And what is vowed to be holy, must be holy (XVI,15). The laws are not a smokescreen, but are formulated because the Temple could, at any time, be clean.

Though we have entered the realm of speculation, it seems apparent that the CD community could not simply excise the Temple from their communal memory. The inclusion of Temple laws tells us how much the Temple meant to them and to their collective consciousness. They wrote Temple law because they wanted the Temple to be used; yet, they cared enough that they would not use it in a state of uncleanness and contribute to its defilement.

The section XI,19-23 offers an alternative to Temple usage. In this passage an offering may not be sent "by the hand of any man affected with any of the types of uncleanness" (XI,19-20). Therefore, only community members could deliver an offering, all others being in a state of perpetual uncleanness.[109] But to indulge in an informal <u>qal vahomer</u>, if the offering must be taken by a community

member, how much more must it be delivered to a community member, that is, one who is pure? To use the Temple is to join with, not keep apart from, the "sons of corruption." An alternative is given: "the prayer of the righteous is like an offering of delight" (XI,21). A prayer is preferable to becoming unclean, and to deliver an offering to the Temple would put one in a state of ritual impurity. Only the purity of the CD community is not suspect. The CD community, in a purer state than the priests of the Temple, must be set apart.

The inclusion of Temple law, then, was not theoretical: the laws were formulated to be used. However, XI,19-21 gives us a clue to the actual situation: the altar could not be used except to be made unclean.[110] Therefore, prayers could be substituted. The passage VI,11-14 indicates that to defile the altar was to break the covenant, and the precept indicates that the Temple was in a state of perpetual defilement. The CD community member could not use the Temple, so the recourse of prayer was offered. What this indicates about the CD community itself is not only their isolation from the Temple cult and the nation of Israel, but also their continuing allegiance to an institution they could no longer use. The reference in the CD legal code which Murphy-O'Connor gives for precept three is actually an epilogue to the laws which have preceded it, and

which include precept four (the Sabbath laws) and precept thirteen ("keep apart from all forms of uncleanness"). To say that these laws are stricter than those which were being observed by the nation in general is to state the obvious. The concern with strict observance of the CD community's purity regulations is overwhelming. Coming on the heels of the precept concerning proper Temple observance, or the lack thereof, the purity laws take on added significance. To examine each law is beyond the scope and purpose of this study; our purpose is to determine what social realities these laws direct us to in general.

Two examples will be examined. The first is found in XII,13-14 and is concerned with the community's dietary laws. The passage reads, "As for fish, let them not eat them unless they have been split while alive and their blood has been poured away" (XII,13-14). Rabin says that this question "exercised the Rabbis," but there is no indication that the law was ever followed in general observance.[111] The second example regards the Sabbath. It says,"Let him not open a pitch-sealed vessel on the Sabbath" (XI,9). Rabbinic law, according to Rabin, allows not only opening such a vessel, but also breaking it open.[112] The point is, the law the CD community follows is that of Israel, but with a unique, sectarian focus which interprets it or formulates

it more strictly than the nation in general. These instances are not unique.

George Foot Moore, in his seminal work on the CD, made many interesting and still relevant observations.[113] Referring to the Sabbath code, he says, "The same rigorous tendency which appears in the attitude of the sect in regard to marriage pervades the whole legal part of the work before us."[114] He goes on to say that "the things which the sect esteems of vital importance (are) polemic zeal for a code which at every point is more rigorous than that of the Pharisees (and is) the salient characteristic of both parts of the book."[115] At each step, Murphy-O'Connor agrees: their interpretation of the law is more rigorous.[116]

While we may wish to temper Murphy-O'Connor's and Moore's observations, since in fact in one or two instances general Jewish observance was stricter, the point holds true that the community observes purity and Sabbath regulations more strictly.[117] The concern with purity and holiness serves to isolate the community from the nation. Who, but they, were so strict? Who, but they, observed the law in their distinct manner? Their desire to observe such strict standards of purity set them apart from the nation. They were unable to associate with anyone who did not keep the law as rigorously as they did. Ultimately, the CD community's concern was that the distinction between clean and

unclean be precisely set, and that they desire holiness above all else. They were the elect.

The fifth precept concerns the keeping of the feasts and the day of atonement. While the community does not, to our knowledge, keep these more rigorously, they do keep them differently, according to their own findings.[118] What this means in practical terms is that once again they are set apart from the nation. It is apparent that the CD community lived according to a sectarian calendar (III,14-16). Here, the concern is not with the origination of their calendar, its development, or even its usage, but with the fact that the CD community lived according to another calendar.[119] The precept claims that the community follows "the 'finding' of those who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus" (VI,19). While there is no further illumination regarding the keeping of the feasts in the CD community, that they kept them differently is enough.

Because the findings of the CD community were divinely revealed, the great majority of Jews observed and worshipped improperly. The community cannot worship with the nation, when the nation observes the holy days on incorrect dates. Only the CD community is worshipping God in an observant manner.

This worship, of course, has social implications, and causes. Shemaryahu Talmon concludes:

> The provocative recognition of a method of calendation deviating from that sanctified by normative Jewry served as an effective indication for aspirations of social independence ... The sectarians from the Judaean desert constitute a characteristic and enlightening example of this phenomenon.[120]

Of course, their social situation gave impetus to a method of calendation as much, or more than, a method of calendation gave impetus to a new community. The unique method of calendation was one more way of defining themselves as the chosen community. They made sense of their isolation by setting themselves apart even further. If they were marginalized, from their point of view it was only because they were purer and holier.

The sixth precept, like the fifth, has no section in the CD legal code. The setting aside of the tithes and the first fruits is necessary, but does not necessitate sectarian reformulation. The Holy things must be set aside, according to Lev. 22:2, and no one with an uncleanness may approach them. Due to the necessity of taking these to the Temple, and in light of our explication of the community's relationship with the Temple, it seems that this ordinance was not obeyed, or the offerings set aside in the community. This ordinance stresses, once again, the centrality of obedience to the Temple cult even beyond its confines or sphere of influence.

This has been the entire focus of the Sabbath and purity regulations: to obey a unique, sectarian conception of the law beyond the confines of the Temple. While they are rooted strongly in the Holiness Code, the traditions of Israel, the CD community itself has become the chosen remnant. Their law is stricter and different. To be holy is to be a member of their community. While their stance was unique, in their understanding, it was necessary. The CD community had to remain pure: set apart from sin and wickedness.

iii) Organizational Regulations

The community is the actualization of their precepts and belief structure. What kind of community are we dealing with? The organizational regulations are scattered throughout the text of the "Laws" and are listed according to their placement in the text.

Concerning Judges: X,4-10

The judges were to be chosen from the community for a special occasion or a certain length of time (X,4-5). There were ten judges, six from the non-priestly tribes of Israel and four from the tribe of Aaron and Levi (X,6). The judges were to be knowledgeable in the book of "Hagu" and in "the teachings of the covenant" (X,6). The judges were to be

twenty-five to sixty years of age, lest they be senile (X,7-10).

That the priests were elected, and that six were of the non-priestly tribes of Israel, may be seen as an indication of Lawrence Schiffman's claim that although "the sectarian texts uniformly accord the Zadokite priests a position of superiority in the conduct of the sect's affairs ... by the completion of the sectarian corpus as we have it, this role had become more and more ceremonial, or formalistic, with the increasing democratization of the sect."[121] But does the fact that six judges are of non-priestly tribes indicate an increasing democratization? With what earlier stage of development is this "increasing" democratization to be compared? Even in Deut. 17 non-priestly judges are envisaged. The actual number of judges, ten, was not unknown in Temple law.[122] So, if the court is moving towards democratization, it is certainly not borne out in this passage.

Concerning Camp Communities: XII,8 - XIII,7

The camps were to have a minimum of ten members, and then expand by a like number (XIII,1-2). For every ten members, a priest had to be present; he was the instructor of the community (XIII,2-3). If he was not expert in some part of the law, then a Levite was chosen by lot (XIII,4-5). For the law of blemishes, though, the priest was to be in-

structed by the overseer; this was the priest's duty, even if he was an imbecile (XIII,6-7).

The camps, then, were ruled by priests. Though a Levite could be chosen in some instances, as the procedure regarding the law of blemishes makes clear, the priest, even if not mentally worthy, was the final authority. Above the priest was the overseer; he was the final authority for all the camps. Though there was some indication of democratization, the camps were basically still run by priests, and structured in a hierarchical manner.

Concerning the Overseer: XIII,8-19

The overseer's initial duties were of a religious nature, making certain that there not be one "oppressed and broken in his congregation" (XIII,8-11). The overseer was responsible for all new converts to the community, as well as for placing them according to their status. Without the overseer's approval, no one could be brought into the congregation (XIII,11-13). Trade with other Jews was only for cash, and no trade was performed without the overseer's permission (XIII,14-17). Divorce, too, was only carried out with the overseer's permission (XIII,18).

The overseer was the ultimate authority in all matters, not only religious but economic. Democracy was not the order of the day where the overseer was concerned. While his first duties were religious in nature, his economic

duties were not that different in kind. Relations with the "children of the pit" were to be only in cash, and only with the overseer's permission. Trade with gentiles was not permitted, according to Rabin.[123] The major concern appears to be avoiding contact with that which would defile: the "sons of corruption" and their wickedness. While economics may have dictated that some trade take place, it was kept to a minimum to avoid the stain of sin. The purity of the community was the foremost concern. In this way, the overseer's ultimate authority is much like that of the High Priest. The holiness of the community, and its religious strength, were the real concern. Economic concerns were subservient to the religious, and determined by the religious leader.

Concerning Rank and Precedence Among Men: XIV,3-12

The order of rank among the CD community was priests, Levites, Israelites, and proselytes (XIV,3-6). Each community was ruled by a priest, and all the communities were ruled by the overseer (XIV,7-10). The overseer determined matters of litigation and judgement (XIV,8-12).

This passage confirms what has been determined by the other passages. The community was hierarchically structured, much like the Temple. The priests ruled the camps, and all the camps were ruled by the overseer, who functions as the High Priest. Claims to democracy seem to be exagger-

ations, as the priests still commanded the highest rank and precedence among the community members.

The organizational regulations indicate that the community, with the overseer at the head of all camps, and each camp being run by a priest, was hierarchically structured. Goran Forkman claims that the drive to Holiness, and its reflection in the community regulations, "results in an almost extreme hierarchically constructed community."[124] The Zadokite priests, as seen in the structuring of the men by importance, still rank first.

If there was a move to increased democratization among the CD community, it was not accomplished by eliminating the priestly hierarchy. It was not accomplished by moving towards the lowest common denominator, but by moving to the highest: all men were to become as priests. Bertil Gärtner says,

> A number of the characteristics of the temple priests which distinguished them from the common people are stressed in the Qumran texts, but here they are applied to the whole community ... certain aspects of the priest' ideal of sanctification were elevated into general conditions of membership of the community.[125]

So it is true, the Sons of Zadok remain above all others and first in the community hierarchy; yet the whole community, in other ways, are the Sons of Zadok.

In IV,1-5 the Sons of Zadok seem to include the entire community, the elect of Israel, which in this passage are

those who "shall arise in the end of days" and minister in God's Temple. Again, in V,5, the priestly designation Sons of Zadok, refers to the entire community. Finally, this does not distract from the hierarchy of the community, one which must have been maintained if the Hasidic split was due to the Zadokites being denied their rightful place in the Temple hierarchy, but instead points to the fact that priests and Israelites were joined in a common bond, and that a high standard of purity imparted holiness to all members of the covenant.[126] The drive of the group, says Forkman, was "the quest for Holiness"; the transfer of holiness from the Temple to a community.[127]

An Analysis

How then do we interpret their response? What did it mean for the CD community to be Israel in their new setting? They were a rigorously strict community, set apart to maintain purity and Holiness. They called for love within the community, charity and respect, but avoidance of all those beyond the confines of their closed community. The community was physically set apart; the members were alienated and marginalized, yet their programme was a return to Israel, an act of fidelity to that from which they were alienated.

How did the community maintain fidelity to Israel? They did not reject Israel, they reinterpreted what it meant

to be Israel in their social situation, and called the nation through their example to holiness. The community appeals "to continuity in some sense with the previous covenant" and "is evidence that the document addresses those who retain some allegiance to the old 'Israel'."[128] They care about Israel enough to offer a programme of cultic renewal. Their concern with purity and separateness was a concern and attempt by the sect to "organize a perfect society in a still-to-be-perfected world."[129] Or to put it another way, their concern was to let their society function as all of Israel should. They did not reject the Temple, they tried to replace it through the pure confines of their community.

So while it is true that they were contemptuous of the Temple in its current state and boasted of the superiority of their law,[130] their ordinances were an attempt "to construct a society which constituted a sanctuary from the evils which surrounded its members and which would ready them for the soon-to-dawn eschaton."[131] The sect acted as a replacement Temple "seeking the purity and sanctification of the cult through the medium of sectarian life and observance."[132] Not only that, but "formal conduct of the sect's affairs continued to be controlled by the Zadokite priests. They were the legitimate leaders to be entrusted with the conduct of the sacred cult in Jerusalem, now being defiled,

in the view of the sect, by others unworthy of their position."[133] The sect was organized as the Temple cult, with an overseer (High Priest), and priests below him, running the community's affairs.

The community was conducted as a new Temple, their laws were an attempt to achieve perfection and purity. Their community was a place in which to worship, because their community was the sanctuary. Only in their midst was Israel fulfilling her mission, and only within the community could God be met in purity. From social necessity arose a more spiritualized cult.

The community did not seek perfection only on earth, but their present day actions spoke of a community preparing for future perfection. "Those who remain will form a purified community in which the ideal of the elect community will be fulfilled. Since it belongs to an age to come, it is an eschatological community."[134] In creating a replacement Temple, the CD community was preparing for the new age, the fusion of the nation with the Kingdom. By doing so, they

> ensured the purity of the sect as a sanctuary of separateness which prepared its members for the eschaton. The eschaton itself was to be celebrated in absolute purity. Here the world of the present merges with that of the future. The insistence on purification in this world is also preparation for the age to come.[135]

The community sought purity in the present to ensure perfection in the future.

The anguish of the community's alienation led them not only to critique society, but to build a new society. Their response to their status as outsiders was to redefine what it meant to be inside. Yet, in their redefinition they clung to a vision of Israel, that is, they remained pure, they sought love not vengeance, and they acted out of charity. They strove to remain free from sin, and attempted to create a pure society. Their vision of Israel grew from their allegiance to the nation in its ideal form.

But it was the persecution and alienation which drove them to the desert that determined how they would reinterpret their belief. As Schiffman says, the laws which the community derived were "particularly appropriate to the kind of society" they created.[136] By their withdrawal they were forced to choose certain laws and reject others. Their social position partially determined their legal ordinances: legal concerns grew from social realities.

The CD community was alienated from the mainstream of Israel in their religion and culture, this much has been determined; and as a result they withdrew to a place of exile. Alienation arises from that to which one holds real allegiance, though, and the community did not sever their allegiance to the nation. Their marginal status was inter-

preted in a meaningful and purposeful sense: as the election of God. The marginalized community had begun to think of themselves, in spite of their alienation, in a positive light. Only they retained adherence to the True Israel.

The community generated a critique of the existing social order, namely, those who drove them to the desert through their betrayal and persecution. The nation was rejected as being corrupt and its people evil. The critique, certainly, was not one of sophistication, though it did warn of allegiance to foreign powers, which would ultimately destroy the Jerusalem Temple. It warned of anything less than the ideal. The community protested against the way in which Israel lived, specifically, against compromising its religion for political gain. The community called for a return to the values of the nation as revealed by God.

While their call was not heeded, they did offer an alternative society. In the spirit of the marginalized, they imagined a world of perfection, a world free of sin, a world they tried to create. They attempted to create a new society, to prepare for the eschaton and gain deliverance from the wickedness of the world. Because the Temple was not theirs, they sought another way, a special way. Salvation was only available through the community. Only through the community could purity be attained.

The community called to God against the unrighteous nation. They called for the redemption of the nation. Their very existence offered proof that they would not only not fade away, but would exist to flourish and offer an alternative path to Israel: a path over which they ultimately had no control or choice. The narrow path they walked, while painful and disruptive, caused them to locate the ills of the nation and choose a new way.

CHAPTER THREE

The CD community is nothing if not the product of a particular religion, historical period, geographical area, and social context. They stand alone; they are unique. Bryan Wilson, a scholar of sectarianism, argues strenuously that the uniqueness of each community be observed. He claims that "cultural differences and historical specificity cannot be ignored for facile comparisons."[137] Before the community symbolizes a type, it is the concrete example only of itself. This integrity has been maintained in our study of the CD community.

The study of sectarianism, though, asks that we move from the particular to the general, in order to see each group in the context of an ideal-type model and in order to see how the particular fits in an overall schema. This is the search for commonalities and generalities that the study of society is concerned with. Though a byproduct of this search may be a clearly emerging picture of a sect's uniqueness, the immediate concern is to locate common origins and responses that the CD community shares, or does not share, with other sectarian movements. This will be done by applying the ideal-type of a sect to the data gathered from

the text of the CD, thus allowing us to see points of divergence and intersection in the quest to ascertain if the CD community is, or is not, a sect.

An ideal-type is a construct, used to identify a sect by examining if the group in question adheres to the "logical coherent patterns of sectarianism."[138] The ideal-type is not meant to be a substitute for historical or textual research; the ideal-type is a tool. "Type-constructs are not intended simply to allow us to designate classes of phenomena: they are to indicate, as we have said, the expectable logic of a given genus of phenomena."[139] The ideal-type points us in the right direction and allows us to see where conformation is taking place among groups. If sects simply conformed to an ideal-type, however, the application of an ideal-type to a community is all that would be necessary to determine if a community is a sect.[140]

In the case of the CD community, though, the application of the sectarian ideal-type <u>is</u> how the determination of the community as sect will be made. As mentioned in the "Introduction," the historical sociologist turns sociology and sociological theory upside down. Theory is a set of suppositions of what is likely to happen in a certain situation given a certain set of circumstances. The study of the CD has inverted sociological theory, saying in effect, "This is what has happened according to the text; how do these

findings about this community fit with what sociological theorists have found?" This method is, in fact, an ideal testing ground for modern sociological theory, either to buttress or diminish it. The data is there, how does it fit? Historical sociology, then, does have a classificatory role, at least in one sense, but it does not diminish or deny the need for textual research.

A sect, any sect, will not conform to the ideal-type in all ways; this must be made clear. As Wilson says, "the specification of types must have due regard for divergencies" in the comparison of data and groups.[141] Sects are not always "more or less similar" in organization, ideology, social composition, and social structure.[142] Many sects are different in many ways, though they all adhere to the ideal-type to the degree that we can speak confidently of similarities among groups.

The ideal-type of sect, however, may attempt to cover too large an area in too general a way; it is not specific enough. For this reason, Wilson, Peter Berger, and others, have suggested sub-types to complement the general sectarian ideal-type.[143] These sub-types, very simply, try to find more specific groupings among sectarian movements. These sub-types Wilson has categorized as "responses to the world," a designation this study has no difficulty accepting.

What is a Sect?

Is the CD community a sect? Though classified as one, they have never been examined rigorously as one. This is a distinctly modern, technical term, but it is bandied about so loosely in discussions of Biblical literature that it has lost its impact and meaning. One example should suffice. Leah Bronner, in her book titled Sects and Separatism During the Second Jewish Commonwealth, never defines what a sect is, how she is using the term, or its implications.[144] The meaning of sect is not self-evident. The sociological literature is not agreed as to what the term means, so the best approach is to define the term as it will be used and adhere to the confines of the given definition. To attempt a study of sectarianism without defining sect is inexcusable.

What is a sect? And can the model of sect, properly, be applied to the CD community? The term sect, according to Bryan Wilson,

> acquired its currency in sociology from the writings of Ernst Troeltsch, the German theologian and sociologist, who sought to characterize the distinction within Christianity of two types of radically opposed organizational forms - the Church and the sect.[145]

The Church and the sect represent "two radically different structural and value orientational tendencies in Christianity."[146] This antithesis, Berger believes, is not an

"accident of research," but part of the "inner logic of social-religious groupings themselves."[147]

Max Weber sees the Church as a political institution, capable of using force, and possessing a "normative order."[148] The Church, then, according to Weber and others, is a correlate of the respectable majority, the societal mainstream, tied to political, national, and economic interests.[149] The sect, on the other hand, is the "heroic minority," who harbour separatist and ascetic attitudes to the world; they exist on the fringe. The Church, then, is the established religious order; the sect is defined, in opposition to the Church, as a splinter group which arises in protest against the established order.[150]

Can the model of the sectarian ideal-type be applied to the CD community with validity? Does the term have any significance beyond its developmental period, or beyond Christianity? Ideally, sociological theory, the study of sectarianism included, wishes to transcend cultural and historical differences:

> it has been characteristic of sociological theory - perhaps influenced in this respect by the model afforded by theoretical physics - that its concepts should be valid for a timeless social universe, without regard to cultural specificity or historical contingency, as if geography and history had no relevance for theoretical models and constructs.[151]

The relevance of sociological theory is found in its application beyond the period in which it was developed. While

"a false sense of timelessness and a historicity of particular concepts" is not desirable, a sense of timelessness is what the historical sociologist seeks, and this can only be measured by the application of a particular model or construct.[152]

The validity of cross-cultural and trans-historical application is not found wanting if, as Emile Durkheim says, a theory "is applied to so limited a number of societies that each of them can be studied with sufficient precision."[153] While this may mitigate against a fully transcendent theory, at least in practice, it does allow for the validity of comparative sociology. Social theory is not rooted, if the proper controls are maintained, to a certain time and place.

Also, though the concept of sect was initially developed in a Christian milieu, using Christian models, it has found near universal acceptance and application across religious boundaries. This, of course, rightly follows the sociological claim to transcendent theory. Additionally, and in favour of the application of the model to the CD community, it may rightly be argued that the CD community has the same theological and historical roots as the Christian Church, that in fact, they share the same parent as Christianity. Both grew out of the same Judaic worldview, and both share common attributes; as a result, the CD community

may properly be compared to a model developed in a Christian milieu, if the differences and problems are acknowledged and not denied.

The Community as Sect

The following characteristics of the sectarian ideal-type have been culled from separate, but similar, models developed by Bryan Wilson and Robin Scroggs; these models represent the culmination of refinements made to Ernst Troeltsch's ground-breaking work. Sectarian movements, according to the sectarian ideal-type, share these basic characteristics:

(1) they arise in protest;

(2) they are exclusive, not allowing dual allegiances, and demanding total allegiance;

(3) they claim a monopoly on religious truth;

(4) they are voluntary groups, groups which one joins, but is not born into;

(5) they display a heightened sense of love and brotherhood among their members;

(6) they re-interpret or re-evaluate the assumptions of the established religious order;

(7) they are lay organizations which reject the religious division of labour;

(8) they often harbour millenial beliefs, beliefs about a new age.[154]

Each of these characteristics will be applied to the text of the CD, to see if the community fulfills the requirements of a sectarian movement. Before a sect can respond, however,

they must respond to something, that is, there must be identifiable causes or reasons for a sect to originate. Wilson says, "Among the fundamental issues of importance is the explanation of the emergence and appeal of particular sects at a given time and in a particular cultural milieu."[155] There must be certain social, causal factors common to sectarian movements if responses are to be more or less similar. That is, if sects arise in response to a dominant, established religion, what are the reasons? So, before correlating the characteristics of the sectarian ideal-type with the text of the CD, the origination of sectarian movements in general must be analyzed and compared to the origination of the CD community.

i) Origination

Sects originate, according to Wilson, in four ways: an individual, a charismatic figure, presents a new teaching; an internal schism within an existing sect further splinters the movement; a sect grows more or less spontaneously from a group of "seekers"; or a group of people attempt to revitalize the beliefs and practices of a major religious movement.[156] Underlying all of these is the understanding that "particular groups are rendered marginal by some process of social change; there is a sudden need for a new interpretation of their social position or for a transvaluation of their experience."[157] People form sects because, in some

way, they are expressing "unhappiness in, and revolt against" an unsatisfactory religious experience and position.[158]

The root of sectarian movements is located in alienation. Werner Stark says,

> Sectarianism lies in the alienation of some group from the inclusive society within which it has to carry on its life. It is a kind of protest movement, distinguished from other similar movements by the basic fact that it experiences and expresses its dissatisfactions and strivings in religious (rather than political or economic or generally secular) terms.[159]

The attempt to track down the causes for sectarian origination, then, does not lead to political, economic, or class struggle.[160] The causes of social division and human disaffection are clearly found in the religious experience, in alienation from the religious order.

Alienation from the religious order is not synonymous with relative deprivation. Relative deprivation theory believes that men and women turn to religion for compensation when their social or economic status is not what they are accustomed to or what they expect;[161] religion is something people turn to when they are deprived of status, of some kind, for compensatory reasons. This, however, turns religion into a dependent variable, and is a case of special pleading. First, according to the relative deprivation theory, only sects, not established religions, grasp

religion for compensatory reasons. Why do most people? It is patently unfair to claim that sects attract members because of low social status, but not explain why established religious groups attract, and keep, members. Secondly, the relative deprivation theory denies the irreducibility of the religious experience. It explains religious adherence only in terms of compensation for lack of social status. Religion becomes a dependent variable, explainable through sociological theory.

The relative deprivation theory also misinterprets ancient culture from a thoroughly modern perspective. It sees alienation stemming from social, economic, and political conditions which are unsatisfactory, and finds sects compensating for a loss or lack of status by turning people to religion.[162] Ancient religious splinter groups, though, grew in cultures in which all other considerations were subsumed beneath the religious establishment. Alienation stemmed from religion itself, and, in alienation, these groups did not abandon their religion, but clung to it in a new and unique way. Religion may have compensated for alienation, but it also produced it.

This understanding of alienation is not necessarily related to economic or social status; according to Berger, sects are not necessarily "churches of the disinherited."[163] Sectarian movements may attract the rich and poor, the

powerful and the powerless, because their attraction lies in the fact that they offer something other than social status. Sects are a return, real or imagined, to religious truth, a reclamation of religious status. In the minds of sectarians, their movements are necessary to restore religious truth, truth which has been compromised, reduced, ignored, or lost.

Alienation, then, is caused by a change, or continuing change, in religious belief and practice. Though this may result in a change in social status for some members of a religious order, a lack of social status could be rectified by accepting the changes in religious belief and practice. The alienating factor, for sectarians, is change in the religious order which they are unable or unwilling to accept. This has real social implications: when beliefs change, there are social responses. When inviolable and unalterable precepts are tampered with, alienation will result, among some, from the established religious order. When the truth, accepted as absolute, is understood to have been abused or ignored, social change will occur.

The origination of the CD community is located in alienation from the established religious order. The community sought to restore beliefs and practices which had been ignored or lost. Though there is some indication early in the CD that a charismatic leader, the "teacher of

righteousness" (I,11), has led them into exile, and though their teachings do contain "new" teachings, it seems unlikely that this was the reason for their alienation and subsequent withdrawal. More likely is their attachment to the "old" way, which subsequently led to new practices and beliefs.

In the period of conflict, dissension, and factionalism, the CD community clung to the "old" ways. Because "the priests in the Temple were no longer of the Zadokite family," many priests were rendered marginal.[164] Yet more important than the loss of social status was the loss of religious truth.

> The calendar had changed, the authority of the Torah rested in lay people. Our covenanters decided to boycott the polluted Temple and to send no sacrifices. They became critical and embittered.[165]

The truth had been undercut and compromised; those whom they had trusted to guard the way had betrayed them. The CD community arose in alienation, marginalized, and attempted to revitalize the beliefs and practices they cared for and believed in. Their response was a protest; did they respond as a sect?

ii) The Application of the Ideal-Type

It has been argued that the CD community responded to their alienation from the Temple cult, and mainstream Judaism, through protest. It has been argued that their

very existence is a form of protest. This is the initial component of the sect: it grows from protest. Gregory Baum says,

> while at certain times religion may well serve as protector of the social order, at other times it judges the present social conditions by the ideal of society and produces movements of reform.[166]

The CD community arose in protest and produced a critique of the present day religious, and social, order. Their protest is heard throughout the pages of the CD.

Their initial form of protest was withdrawal. The isolation and pain of exile led to their self-definition as the True Israel. As important as their self-definition, though, was their counter definition of the nation they had left as a wicked nation. Their continuing protest is seen as the condemnation of the "princes of Judah" (VIII,1-21). The nation is further classified as wicked, and so subject to rejection, in I,14-17 and IV,20 - VI,1. The nation of Israel was sinful, and for their sin they would be destroyed (II,5-7).

The protest of the CD community was not only symbolic and literary, it was substantial; it was expressed in the building of a new society, the creation of the True Israel. Their protest was that much more pointed because they did not simply reject Israel, they attempted to build a new Israel. As P.R. Davies has argued, the community retained its allegiance to Israel.[167] Though they rejected the

status quo, they maintained fidelity to Israel, albeit a unique conception of Israel, and so ensured that their protest would be heard.

The CD community showed Israel how to live. In protest,

> they are simultaneously both radical and conservative. They are radical in the challenge they pose to authority; they are conservative in that they often seek to reassert moral and religious precepts which they see corrupted.[168]

The CD community called for a return to the "old" way, but interpreted it in a radically new manner. Since only they had access to the truth, God could only be found through them. Their protest asserted that the foundations and institutions were corrupt, and in need of a complete overhaul.

In their community holiness could be found. Holiness can be understood as separateness, to be set apart from sin and wickedness; the summation of Israel's task is to be set apart.[169] The CD community re-evaluated what it meant to be Israel, and what it meant to be holy, and so created a new community. They retained fidelity to Israel, but their protest forced them to "adopt procedures that are in themselves radically new."[170] In response to Israel's sin, they created a separate and isolated community, set apart to stay apart. This was their final protest.

Closely aligned with the protestation of a sect is their re-interpretation or re-evaluation of the established

order and its assumptions. This re-interpretation has been hinted at, but it has not been examined in any depth. According to Robin Scroggs, the sect "rejects the assumptions of reality upon which the establishment bases its world and creates a new world with different assumptions."[171] The sect does not reject the old order per se, but makes sense of it in a new and vital way.

Israel's foundational assumptions were basically threefold: they were the elect of God; God was worshipped in the Temple; and obedience to God was expressed in obedience to the Law. These assumptions, in the CD community, would be revised. The CD community, not all of Israel, is the elect of God (I,4; II,11-13). The CD community, not Israel, is in possession of the Law (III,13-17; VI,2-4). And the CD community rejects the use of the Jerusalem Temple (VI,11-14; VII,13-17), replacing it with a rigorously strict and purified community. In this way, they became the holy community. Their re-evaluation was an indication, not of their severing of cultic ties, but of their desperate and creative attachment to Israel, however tenuous.

Leah Bronner's understanding of the Qumran communities in general shows little sensitivity and even less understanding of their mission. She says, "They had withdrawn from society, took no interest in the welfare of the Jewish community and worried only about the salvation of their own

souls."[172] This displays a superficial understanding of the CD community's task. Sectarian re-evaluation is due precisely to the fact that the sect cares deeply about the institutions it abandons. If it did not, it would simply abandon the established religion out of hand. The CD community does not abandon the religion and so displays yet another mark of a sect.

The sect is, though it may set its sights higher, always a minority group; it is marked by voluntarism.[173] The sect exists only in contrast to the Church, or an established religion, and so, by definition, it can only be a minority group. A sect is joined voluntarily, and acceptance is due to religious worthiness or understanding. A person may be born into a Church, but he must join, and prove he is worthy of belonging to, a sect.

This is true of the CD community. In their own understanding, they have been chosen by God, but even they admit people may choose their way (I,4-5; II,4-5; XX,22-24). From our vantage, it seems clear that membership in the CD community was dependent upon acceptance of the tenets of the community. If a member fell from the way, he could rejoin when his punishment was fulfilled (XX,207). Those who did not hold fast to the way would not gain salvation (XX,13-14). It is clear that membership was dependent upon acceptance of and adherence to the community's standards; the

watchwords were voluntary obedience and religious qualification. A person only belonged if he chose to belong. Personal adherence to the way of the community was the final arbiter of membership. This is explicitly stated in XIII,11-12, a passage regarding the overseer's acceptance of new members: "and everyone that is added to his congregation, let him examine him about his actions and his understanding and his strength and his courage and his property." This statement placed the CD community in the role of the sect, voluntarily joined and dependent upon religious qualification.

Closely related to this is a sect's exclusivity. If membership is dependent upon religious qualification, and so is stringent and demanding, a sect is necessarily exclusive.[174] A sect demands total allegiance to its way, and does not allow dual allegiances. It demands sustained standards among the membership, and those who do not adhere to the rigorous way must accept the consequences. As Wilson says, in the Church-sect typology, what often distinguishes the sect from the Church " is the intensity of their commitment."[175] Sectarian movements seem, at times, to be fuelled by a fire that is insatiable and inexhaustible.

The CD community considered their way the only way to God. For those who ignored the ordinances of God, there was "great wrath with fiery flames" (II,5). As the prologue to

the "Memorandum" indicates, these ordinances were available only to those in the covenant, those who avoided the Temple and observed the precepts (VI,11-14). The precepts include the admonition to "keep apart from the sons of corruption" and to "make a distinction between clean and unclean" (VI,14-15; VI,17). The community's legal ordinances were so designed as to isolate and keep its members apart from external social relations. This was necessary because all others, including Israel, were in a state of ritual uncleanness (XI,19-21). Israel was guilty of sin and whoever "associates with them will not be held innocent" (V,14-15). The CD community demanded total allegiance to the community and its standards, and total rejection of and separation from the nation of Israel.

Those who did not uphold the standards of the community, but engaged in dual allegiances, would ultimately face death. "And thus is the judgement on all members of His covenant who have not held fast to these the ordinances, being visited to destruction by Belial" (XIX,13-14). Those who rejected the commandments of God, who "turned back and acted treacherously and departed from the well of living water," would not find salvation during the end times (XIX,31-35). If a community member broke an ordinance, "he shall be dismissed from the congregation" until he repents, according to the stated punishment, and until that time "no

man may have dealing with him in respect of property or work" (XX,2-7). That is, the straying member was to be shunned. People who ignored the ordinances would have no share in the "House of the Law" (XX,8-13). The exclusivity of the CD community is apparent. They demanded total allegiance, and for those who strayed and did not repent, their fate was the same as that of those who had never belonged.

Aligned with a sect's exclusivity is the sectarian belief that it has a monopoly on religious truth, that is, the sect has something necessitating total allegiance. In Peter Berger's words, "the meaning system claims universal validity" in a sectarian context.[176] The truth is available only through the sect.

God had revealed to the CD community

> the Hidden things in which all Israel had gone astray - His holy Sabbaths and His glorious festivals, His righteous testimonies and His true ways, and the desires of His will, which a man should live by. He opened to them and they dug a well of copious water. (And those who despise it shall not live.) (III,13-17).

Only through the community could the truth be found and salvation gained. The CD community, alone, knew the way of God. In their community, God raised men of understanding and wisdom, and "He let them hear (His voice), and they dug the well," "the well is the law" (VI,2-4). It is this law, given them by God, which enables them to monopolize the truth.

Though their law may be classified as "sectarian" law, as Lawrence Schiffman notes, available only to some select ascetics, this is not how the CD community understood the nature of their revelation. As Stephen Westerholm says of Pharasaic halakhah, so it can be said of the CD halakhah: it was not intended to be sectarian.[177] Their law was for all men.

Their love, however, was not for all men. A sect often spews vitriol on those whom it opposes, while displaying a pronounced sense of love and acceptance among fellow sectarians. As strong as a sect's injunctions may be to remain apart from those outside the community, the sect is equally adamant, or more so, in its injunctions to care for those within the sect.

This characteristic emerged clearly from the section on "Social Relations"; it is, arguably, the easiest component of the sectarian ideal-type to correlate with the text of the CD. While punishment for those who left the community, ignored the community, and persecuted the community was swift and exacting, within the community love was the overriding concern (I,19 - II,1; XX,m-13; XIX,13-14). In precepts seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven and twelve, almost half of those listed in the "Memorandum," which contained the community's most significant laws, the CD community member was asked to cultivate a sense of brotherhood and

love (VI,20 - VII,3). The sense of love and charity within the CD community was of a high level indeed.

The most difficult component of the sectarian ideal-type to correlate with the CD community is organizational. Most sects reject the religious division of labour, that is, the clergy, and are predominantly lay organizations. The CD community, it seems, does or is neither. It is priestly based and priestly run, keeping with its ideal of the Temple in Jerusalem.

The community, according to XIV,3-13, divides itself according to religious rank, namely, Priest, Levite, Israelite, and Proselyte. The overseer is the head of the CD community, and below him are the priests; in tandem, they run the community's affairs, both spiritual and economic (XII,8 - XIII,7; XIII,8-19). The priestly class has precedence and runs the community. The only passage which hints at a breaking down of the religious division of labour is found in X,4-10, concerning the make-up of the court of the judges. In this case, the court is comprised of six Israelites and four of the tribe of Aaron, or priestly caste. This, though, is hardly enough reason to trumpet the coming of democratization.

Schiffman claims that "the sect no doubt accepted the legitimacy of only the Zadokite priesthood."[178] Doubtless, this is so; it has been our argument that the legitimacy of

the Zadokite priesthood was the community's reason for existence. The only democratization to occur in the community, therefore, was that they "attempted to extend the requirements of priesthood to all men."[179] They did not become a predominantly lay organization, but a predominantly priestly organization. In both III,21 - IV,4 and V,5, the priestly title "Sons of Zadok" is taken to mean the whole community; that is, all members were priests. This understanding spans scholarly history and is held not only by Schiffman and Bertil Gartner, but also by George Foot Moore.[180] But, finally, however clever our argumentation becomes, the CD community was not a lay organization.

Schiffman has argued that toward the completion of the Qumran corpus, the priestly role was more formalistic than real, hinting at a lay organization and a breakdown in the religious division of labour. While this may be true in some Qumran texts, this shift is not seen in the CD. While it may have occurred, it is apparent that at the time of writing, the CD community was neither a lay organization nor an organization which had eschewed the religious division of labour.

The final characteristic of the sect is that of millenial hopes of beliefs. From the point of view of sociology, millenial is not used as a religious, technical term; in this instance, however, it could properly be used as

one. It is used, instead, to designate "any conception of a perfect age to come, or a perfect land to be made accessible."[181] Sylvia Thrupp calls it "one of humanity's great inventions."[182] The promise of the millenium is salvation, and according to Berger, salvation, such as the millenium brings, is "the ultimate aim of the meaning system" for the given sectarian movement.[183] This salvation, the fruit of the sectarian life, is only reaped by those within the sect.

The CD community imagined and believed in a perfect age to come. The wicked would be damned (II,5-7), but those in the covenant would gain salvation. To obey the community's law was to guarantee the coming of and the salvific force of the "one who will 'teach righteousness' at the end of days" (VI,9-11). The members of the CD community would not be killed, but would "escape at the time of the visitation" of the Messiah of Israel and Aaron (XIX,9-11).

At the time of the Messiah's coming, the "heart" of those who have held fast

> shall be strong, and they shall prevail over all the inhabitants of the world; God shall pardon them and they shall see His deliverance, for they have taken refuge in His holy name (XX,27-34).

Salvation is the future reward for all those who hold fast to the community's law during the period of wickedness. However, if they have left the way, "they will not be fit to dwell in the land when the Messiah of Aaron and Israel comes in the end of days" (XIII,21-23; also, XII,23 - XIII,1;

XIV,19). Though the community was called to obey the law in the present, the reward for obedience was in the future, the eschaton, when the community would gain salvation.

These eight characteristics of the sectarian ideal-type show the CD community as a sect. They fit, with one exception, the general typology of a sect. Although they are not seen as a lay organization, since the nature of their origin would not allow it, the CD community fits the general pattern of sectarianism. This pattern, formulated and modified by sociologists, has been used as "a sensitizing instrument, alerting us to the distinctive features of particular sects that stand in need of sociological and historical investigation."[184] These distinctive features now again become our concern; finally, the ideal-type is too general and does not offer enough information regarding any particular sect. The CD community is a sect, but this is not enough.

The particularities of the CD community, which were examined in depth in the first two chapters, have been overlooked or sidestepped in the application of the sectarian ideal-type. Sociology, however, offers more. There are sectarian sub-types which apply to sects more specific model, models which take into account the uniqueness and variation of sectarian movements within the larger category of sect. Does the CD community fit with a distinct or

specific sectarian sub-type? Are there other sects which in their specific response and origination are similar to the CD community? If the CD community can be seen as a specific sectarian type, then it will be clear that the nature of their response and origination, though singular, also has universal tendencies.

An Examination of Sectarian Sub-Types

Both Peter Berger and Bryan Wilson differentiate between types of sects. Their typologies share much in common, but show enough disparity to warrant examining them individually. Berger's sub-types are delineated in an exacting manner, though analysis and information regarding the typology is not forthcoming. His typology was developed in the United States, but he believes it "may be applicable outside the field of Christianity" and beyond the United States.[185] He distinguishes between "Enthusiastic," "Prophetic," and "Gnostic" sectarian movements. Within these movements, he distinguishes even further. "Enthusiastic" sects contain Revivalists, Pietists, Holiness groups, and Pentecostals. "Prophetic" sects contain Chiliastic and Legalistic types. "Gnostic" sects are divided into Orientalists, New Thought groups and Spiritists.

The attitude which these sects project toward the world varies with each grouping. "Prophetic" sects attempt either to warn the world or to "conquer" the world, that is, they

have a message to proclaim. "Gnostic" sects, as their name implies, believe they are in possession of secret knowledge, and that the world is irrelevant. The attitude to the world demonstrated by the "Enthusiastic" sects is either avoidance of it or the saving of it. These attitudes manifest themselves in the social structure of the sects. "Enthusiastic" sects, due to their many types, have a variety of social structures. "Prophetic" types have strong leadership and organization, while "Gnostic" types become a small group of initiates. This is the extent, in shorthand, of Berger's discussion.[186]

Where would the CD community fit in this typology? They could be classified as an "Enthusiastic" holiness sect, in that the world is to be avoided, or an "Enthusiastic" revivalist sect, in that the world is to be saved. They may also be seen as a "Prophetic" sect. They believe that the world is to be warned of its impending destruction, which is indicative of a "Chiliastic" sect, but they also hold that the world will be conquered and a new order installed, the dominant motif of the legalistic sects. While the "Gnostic" sects do not enter into the picture, it is not clear, given the paucity of data, if the CD community is to be considered a "Prophetic" or an "Enthusiastic" sect. Berger says, "It goes without saying that the types are often mixed, but usually the sect can be placed clearly, at least within the

three major types."[187] What turns the table in favour of any particular type is Berger's short section on organization or social structure. "Prophetic" sects have strong central leadership and organization, as does the CD community; this, though, is not enough to make a firm conclusion. The information is not as detailed as one might hope; no detailed analysis is offered of the types. So while it may cautiously be assumed that the CD community is a "Prophetic" sect, more research is necessary.

Bryan Wilson, working and developing his model at much the same time as Berger, refines and examines his typology with a more detailed analysis.[188] He defines only four sectarian types, namely, "Conversionist," "Adventist," "Introversionist," and "Gnostic." While Wilson derives his types from the framework of Protestant Christianity, he too believes they have applicability beyond a Christian context. The "Adventist" sect, according to Wilson, "focuses attention on the coming overturn of the present world order."[189] The "Introversionist" sect "direct(s) the attention of its followers away from the world and to the community."[190] A "Conversionist" sect "seeks to alter men, and thereby to alter the world."[191] Finally, a "Gnostic" sect emphasizes a secret and esoteric body of knowledge, engaging in a kind of mysticism.[192] At this point the types, and the

information given, are much like Berger's; however, Wilson offers much more.

With the information examined thus far, the CD community would be considered an "Introversionist" or an "Adventist" sect. Though his material and analysis cannot be reviewed here in full, it soon becomes apparent that the CD community, in Wilson's typology, is primarily an "Adventist" sect.[193] There are nine major characteristics of an "Adventist" sect. The sect seeks an overturning of the present world order, in some eschatological sense. The sect emphasizes its own unique interpretation of the Bible. The sect has high moral standards, and limits membership in the new order to those who are doctrinally pure. Admission to the sect is on the basis of a thorough understanding of the necessary doctrine. The established religious order is considered wicked. The professional clergy is opposed, and a lay ministry is encouraged. The sect is hostile towards the wider society, and avoids society. Separation is a significant concern. The sect's Messiah will not only be a saviour, but a "divine commander," a bringer of wrath. Finally, evangelism is undertaken by the sect, but quick conversions are not sought. The majority of these attributes have emerged or have been examined in the course of this study. The CD community, it seems, is a "type" of sect.

If the CD community is a "type," then there are sects which should show evidence of the same characteristics and attributes as the CD community. One such sect which displays the characteristics of the "Adventist" sect, as well as the strong social structure of Berger's "Prophetic" type, is the early Anabaptists. The early Anabaptists not only share the attributes of the "Adventist" sect, in common with the CD community, but they also share similar origins, self-definition, and organization.

The CD community is a sect, but also a specific type of sect, which has spanned centuries, and arisen at various times throughout history. While care must be taken that historical, social, and religious differences are not glossed over, the early Anabaptists, at each turn, conjure up images of an ancient sect, exiled in the Judaean desert two thousand years ago. They are both examples of a sectarian type which arises out of persecution and alienation. They withdraw and function in isolated, communistic organizational structures. They are quietists who eschew revolutionary tendencies, sometimes evident in their contemporaries. They are primitivists who call for a return to a pristine, unsullied past. Botn the early Anabaptists and the CD community share a response to the world, a response which history tells us is not unique.

The Comparison

The Anabaptists are described by Franklin Littell as "those in the radical reformation who gathered and disciplined a 'true church' (rechte kirche) upon the apostolic pattern as they understood it."[194] They were those Christians in the sixteenth century Christian reformation who opposed not only the Roman Catholic church, but also the reforming mission of Luther. They attempted a return to the early Christian church, as they understood it. Theirs was the radical reformation; they were the radical fringe.

For the most part, the Anabaptists were not revolutionaries; they were quietists. However, Anabaptism, even in its initial stages,, knew many splinter groups. So when Anabaptism is discussed, Thomas Müntzer and his band of revolutionaries often take centre stage in the quest for the core of the Anabaptist experience. They are, though, not Anabaptists in the strictest sense of the term; a definition of Anabaptism must strive to make this clear. "Anabaptists repudiated subjectivism and condemned revolution."[195] When we speak of Anabaptism, we speak of those groups who are the descendants of this historical legacy, groups such as the Mennonites and Hutterites. Müntzer's "Peasant Revolt," however fascinating, existed on the fringe of the movement. The essence of Anabaptism is found in quietism and primitivism.

The Anabaptists, like the CD community, grew out of a long and arduous struggle. The CD community grew out of an Hasidic faction which believed their fellow Hasidim had fallen short of the mark in their struggle, namely, the restitution of the requirements of the High Priesthood, and the restitution of Israel itself. Their sense of bitterness and anger over their betrayal and over what they regarded as a compromise in the faith of Israel was acute.

According to Littell, the Anabaptists shared in this pattern of origination. They believed "that the revival began with Luther and Zwingli, but when the Reformers clung to the old idea of Christendom the radicals counted them out."[196] The Anabaptists were primitivists who, like the CD community, were unable or unwilling to compromise their vision of the Church for political expediency, power, or prestige. They did not want a reformed Church, they wanted a Church of restitution; they wanted an old and mythic way.

They could not envision a compromise in their ideals, and when their compatriots turned away from their vision, they felt betrayed and alienated.

> The Anabaptists in return, nourished the most bitter resentment toward those who had refused to go the whole way on the New Testament pattern and now purposed to persecute those who did. They called Zwingli "more false than the Old Pope."[197]

The Anabaptists saved their vitriol for their former compatriots, those they believed had also wanted to restore

apostolic Christianity. Though they condemned the entire Church, and therefore the society in general, they directed their anger in its strongest terms to their former mates. In the same way, the CD community directed their anger against the Hasidic faction, to whom they were once joined, in stronger terms than against the Hellenizers they initially opposed.

According to the CD, the CD community was the victim of violent persecution, which served to hasten and strengthen their withdrawal. The Anabaptists, too, withdrew from mainstream society, and were further encouraged to continue their pattern of withdrawal by the violent persecution they were subject to. The persecution only led to further, and more entrenched, withdrawal.[198]

If the Anabaptists historical record offers anything, it may be confirmation of what was earlier speculated upon. Though the two historical periods were not identical, both were similar. The reformation grew from increasing discontent and anger among devout Catholics. Disturbed at their situation, they attempted to change it. While Martin Luther and the reformers reached an uneasy truce with the Roman Catholic Church, the Anabaptists would have none of it. Their protest was met with exile and persecution. As a result, they withdrew in alienation and anger. The parallels with the CD community are clear.

In isolation, the Anabaptists, too, devised a unique self-definition. They were the persecuted remnant whom God would save, victims of an agenda such as the early Church experienced.[199] "The brutal pattern of persecution heightened the eschatological note, atrophied the interest in the general social order, and hardened the rigor of enforcement of the special teachings."[200] The radical reformers underwent a change in their self-conception. They were the True Church, naming the nation's sin, shouting the nation's judgement, and eagerly awaiting their own salvation.

This marginalized, alienated, and persecuted community believed they were the elect. They held that tomorrow they would "give the whole earth a new order."[201] Like the CD community, their conception of themselves as the elect was tied to their understanding of the eschaton and tradition. They tried to resurrect the early Church, and thought of themselves as a part of "only a little remnant (ein klaines heuflen)" which had followed the way of Jesus.[202] Because of their fidelity to tradition, their reward was awaiting them, "the restitution of the early Church."[203] They would usher in the new age: "the Anabaptists believed that they were forerunners of a time to come, in which the Lord would establish His people and His Law throughout the earth."[204] The Anabaptists believed, as did the CD community, that all others beyond their community were condemned.

The Church was corrupt and wicked; only adherence to the way of the True Church would save anyone. They were the bearers of a new age and the keepers of the "secret meaning."[205] This new age, a conception borrowed by Christianity from apocalyptic Judaism, had already begun in their congregation.[206] The coming restitution was to be the final restitution of all the ages, and because of this the need for separation from the "fallen" Church was great.

As the CD community, the Anabaptists were to be pure and set apart. Their strict adherence to the Bible influenced all that they did, and set the tone for their separation. Whereas the CD community separated themselves from the Temple, the Anabaptists separated themselves from the Church. Without these dominant institutions guiding their actions, separation from wickedness, and the cultivation of holiness, was dependent upon observance of the law. The communities took on a sacramental character. Littell says that the Anabaptists were "concerned with purification, separating the True Church from power and political interest."[207] The goal of the True Church was spiritual perfection, and to achieve this goal, separation from wickedness was required.

The Anabaptist's law, that which kept them separate, was the guiding principle of their community. Like the law of the CD community, it was revealed law, gathered from

inspired Biblical exegesis.[208] Also like the CD community, the law was not theirs, it was from God. Echoing Schiffman regarding the CD community, Littell says, "Their objective was not to introduce something new but to restore something old."[209] The Anabaptists believed that the Bible was followed correctly in the time of Jesus, but since that time, except for a small group of believers, the correct interpretation had been lost. They had regained this lost way, and forged the impetus for a pure and separated Church.

Due to the Anabaptist's need to maintain strict purity, and also due to continuing persecution, they maintained few external social relations. They considered themselves a "community of saints," and separation from the social order was a necessary prerequisite.[210] The effect of their separation on the social structure was such that Littell is driven to say, Luther "gave a new turn to religious persecution by directing it not against error so much as against the sociological and ecclesiastical effects."[211] As a marked community, the Anabaptists turned inward.

Whereas they ignored and fled the outside world, condemning it all the while, in isolation they turned to each other. Above all, they were a brotherhood, and preferred to be known as such. Littell states that "selfless sharing characterized all groups among the Anabaptists."[212] It is revealing, also, to note that most Anabaptists,

contrary to popular opinion, were not communistic, but allowed private property. Like the CD community, though, there existed a strong sense of community and a highly developed sense of the need for charity.[213]

Their sense of community also led to a strictly governed community, although in this respect the Anabaptists steer a somewhat different course than the CD community. The Anabaptists were a lay organization: "In the first years there were no paid clergy anywhere in the movement, nor were there regularly constituted governors of community life."[214] In practice they were a "priesthood of all believers," and like the CD community they brooked no dissension within their ranks. Their organization was tightly governed by "spiritual government." This is what was known as the "ban" or "shunning"; it was a government which "rests, in the end, upon the threat of expulsion from the congregation of believers."[215] Since the community was joined voluntarily, this threat of expulsion had the effect only of setting the boundaries between those who were "in" and those who were "out". There was no physical force or compulsion involved. The Anabaptists' strong government, like the CD community, rested on spiritual, not political authority.

The Anabaptists, too, were attempting to recreate a purified and sanctified community. They prepared for the

eschaton by weeding out those who wavered in the faith. Though not hierarchical, their form of government was, it seems, every bit as rigorous as the CD community's. Though a lay organization, they took seriously their understanding of themselves as the "community of saints." According to Bryan Wilson, a sect's response to the world and circumstance of origin will, in part, determine a community's organization; in these two cases, the communities are attempts to recreate the dominant institutions they left behind.[216] Both the CD community and the Anabaptists, in isolation, created strict communities designed to cultivate purity within and keep evil at bay.

This short comparison glosses over many of the similarities between the two communities, and basically asks that the differences be acknowledged, though not examined. The differences between the two communities are not this study's concern, though they are plentiful. The concern of this study has been to show that in origination, self-definition, and content of response the CD community holds much in common with the early Anabaptists. While historical and religious differences abound in this, as any, comparison, the generalities we have been seeking have been found. There may, however, be more.

In the "Introduction" to this study, Robin Scroggs' argument was cited that if the data collected by a histor-

ical sociologist showed parts of the whole of a known model, then it is likely that the parts not shown, if not too great in size, could be filled in according to the evidence of the known model. This is, it is acknowledged, a precarious perch, but one which demands that we steal a look. There is much more historical information extant regarding the early Anabaptists then there is about the CD community. Can the Anabaptists, similar to the CD in so many ways, allow us to fill in historical blanks? Though we enter the realm of speculation cautiously, it is not without some measure of confidence that we begin this search. Two questions, though there may be many more, will concern us; Did the CD community engage in missionary work, as most "Adventist" sects do and the Anabaptists did? And what is the relationship between the CD communities and the communities spoken of in the other Qumran documents?

Much has been made of the CD community's relationship to other Jewish splinter groups, such as Zealots and Essenes; many scholars believe that the CD and the other Qumran documents refer to the same group. There are many similarities and many differences between the many groups, but what is the best approach to take? What is the relationship between the CD, the Qumran documents, the Zealots, and the Essenes? The history of the Anabaptists may offer a clue.

Franklin Littell says that "the first decade (of the Anabaptists existence) was spent winnowing out competing concepts and making the main teachings concrete in the life of disciplined congregations."[217] That is, in the initial fervour and excitement, coupled with the conflict common to the age and common among products of subjective revelation, Anabaptism knew many splinter groups. As the movement grew, each group fragmented, but in some way retained or threw off the cloak of Anabaptism. Historically, these divisions remained, leaving us with Mennonites, of many stripes, Amish, and Hutterites. Are they the same group? No. Are they related? Very much so. In the rich religious soil of the sixteenth century, many sects grew. To acknowledge their many similarities is necessary, but to attempt to classify them as one group is foolhardy. The similarities are extensive, but they are discrete groups.

This approach, it seems, is the best one to take with the related groups of the intertestamental period. They are related, yet they are not the same. No good end is achieved if particularities of texts are ignored for the sake of commonalities; both must be respected, but the particular must take the upper hand. It is likely that the CD community, the Qumran communities, the Essenes, and the Zealots share, some more, some less, common roots. While closely related, they are all unique.

The explosive and troubled historical period which these groups grew in makes fragmentation likely. So, too, does the reception of divine revelation beyond the confines of the parameters of the established religion. In this case, the close relationship of communities and texts should be studied, but the integrity and uniqueness of each maintained. Instead of attempting to synthesize textual contradictions, we should accept them. The CD, then, is a relative of the other Qumran documents, and the CD community a relative of the Essenes, but not necessarily synonymous with either. P. R. Davies says, the Church evolved, as did Qumran, and "redefined its hopes." Both the New Testament and Qumran preserve "a range of beliefs." Did they believe them equally? Far more likely is that many doctrines "reflect inner controversy and historical development."[218] Attention to this approach would be a positive development in Qumran studies, and one which should be actively encouraged.

A further question concerns the entire mission of the CD community. They withdrew and were isolated, but was their only concern their own salvation? A mark of "Adventist" sects is their proselytizing; the Anabaptists, persecuted, isolated, and concerned with their own spiritual perfection, did function in a missionary role. Is this function a product of Christianity? Perhaps, but a message

of salvation and deliverance may also be the product of a certain sectarian type, namely, a type which believes there is only one way to God and they are in possession of it. Did the CD community function in a missionary role?

Clearly, they know proselytes (XIV,3-6), but did they actively seek them? The tone of the CD has made some wonder if its purpose, in whole or in part, was to gain converts. Both Jerome Murphy-O'Connor and Samuel Iwry believe this to be the case.[219] Samuel Iwry was the first to suggest that the CD itself may have had a missionary function. He says,

> It states with a kind of manifesto to the people, in which the author, speaking in the first person and with a host of admonitions, seeks to introduce his group and ideas to a new and wholly different environment.[220]

Murphy-O'Connor takes issue with Iwry's understanding of the document, as a whole, functioning in a missionary context, but he believes portions of it did. He believes that II,14 - VI,1 was a missionary document.[221] While the problem cannot be discussed in depth, Murphy-O'Connor's argumentation is convincing, and the issue takes on a whole new light in relation to a sectarian model. The CD, it seems likely, could have had a missionary function, and this is only buttressed by the role the Anabaptists had, and "Adventist" sects have, as missionaries in much the same social context.

Finally, the CD community is not just like the Anabaptists, nor is it just like any other sect. Each sect is

the unique product of a specific historical, geographical, and social context. There are, however, factors of origination and response, in self-definition, social relations, and organization, which speak to the universality of social and religious response. Both halves of the equation are necessary: the sect is both unique and common. The response of the CD community is rooted in, and transcends, time. The CD community, the product of ancient Palestine and the harsh Judaean desert, can be favourably compared to the general ideal-type of a sect, and to a specific sect which arose in sixteenth century Europe. Yet, its response to its alienation, its re-interpretation of the twin pillars of Judaism, Torah and Temple, and its organization, based on Temple cultic practices, is nothing if not singular. The CD community, a common and general type, stands alone.

Conclusions

This study proposed to ask new questions; in particular, the introduction of a sociological method to the study of the CD was pursued. This study did not apply a particular theory, or make use of any one conceptual framework; rather the thesis attempted, in the analysis of the text, to show at all times an awareness of and sensitivity to social forces and social reality. The intention was not to denigrate historical-critical, theological, or literary methods, but rather to explore the CD with a new focus. New ques-

tions reveal new understanding. And "subjection to social dynamic is as much a part of our finitude as any other dimension of society's impingement on individual freedoms."[222] In other words, the introduction of this approach is long overdue. In the Introduction to the study, I argued strongly that a sociological approach was theoretically legitimate and justifiable; but how has it clarified the reading of the CD?

As an exercise in historical sociology, our study has been concerned "both with understanding from within and explaining from without; with the general and the particular."[223] The concern was with understanding the CD community as a particular and unique product of ancient Judaism, and with their unique origination and response; the concern was with the CD community as a social type, and as a sect and type of sect. While the intended goals may have been missed, this study was interested in understanding the CD in two ways, namely, as the product of a community which can, at least partially, be explained and understood sociologically as the product of social forces and social events; and as containing a response which was not only a distinctly sectarian response, but a type of sectarian response which is in evidence throughout history.

The CD, and the community of which it speaks, can be understood sociologically. This was the initial, and

dominant, concern. The CD community arose in a period of conflict and upheaval. The beliefs and practices the CD contains were also influenced by, and a product of, this historical period. Instead of simply looking at the document as a theological treatise, we have treated the CD as the product of an historical context. That is, the CD contains the responses to a time of suffering, conflict, oppression, and finally, alienation and isolation. In the light of this changing world, as reflected in the "Laws," it was necessary for the CD community to ask, and answer, what it meant to be a Jew in their new social situation. This re-evaluation became necessary when the rules of succession to the Temple priesthood were changed, and when they lived in isolation apart from the Temple and mainstream Judaism. What did it mean to be holy when the fundamental rules were altered?

The response of the CD community was to withdraw and, in isolation, build a radically new society. Yet, they also clung to the old way, namely, to the Law and to the Temple. Neither was rejected, but both were re-interpreted. And in their new context, they yearned for deliverance from pain and the restitution of the way of ancient Judaism. They had suffered:

> That Qumran would be interested in a messiah or deliverer sent by God could be anticipated from the troubled times (2nd cent. B.C. - 1st cent. A.D.) which frame its history, and from its nature

as a small sect persecuted even by fellow Jews.[224] In their social situation, in the context of conflict, alienation, and social change, they became a new Israel. They were the True Israel, seeking redemption, alone in the desert, apart from the sinful nation, purifying their community for the eagerly awaited eschaton.

The basis for this study has been Emile Durkheim's foundational understanding that "the determining cause of a social fact should be sought among the social facts preceding it and not among the states of the individual consciousness."[225] This study has asked that social reality be acknowledged in its impact on the development of ideas and institutions. Or,

> collective representations, emotions, and tendencies are caused not by certain states of the consciousness of individuals but by the conditions in which the social group in its totality is placed.[226]

The CD, and the CD community, are rooted in and the product of an historical and social context. It is from this understanding that new light has been shed on the text, and that the reading and interpretation of it is clarified.

The study asked, though, not only that the CD community be understood from a sociological point of view, but also as a continuing sociological type. Their response was in one sense unique, but in another sense the response of a sectarian type. There is evidence that in their origination,

self-definition, and belief and organization, the CD community was a sect. Though the CD community was presented as a classical sect, firmly rooted in the Church-sect typology, the typology was also used for purposes beyond those found in the sociological literature. This study has indicated that the rise of sectarianism is a product of a certain perceived decay in an established religion, and that the sect is a legitimate expression of the established religion.

We may, therefore, offer some reflections as to why the CD community, in particular, and other Judeo-Christian sects, in general, respond as they do in periods of intense social crisis. While conclusions at this point cannot legitimately be put forth, some avenues of future research into sectarian development have been suggested by this study. Certain sectarian movements, in the midst of vast, alienating, and frightening social change will respond in a manner which I term the community in the role of the prophet.

Both Judaism and Christianity have historically allowed for personal revelation and prophecy; men have served as the voice of God within society. The prophet's role is that of "marginalized insider," one who stood on the fringes of the given community, but who best embodied its highest values and beliefs. The prophet, who cares deeply for his community, criticizes it because it falls short of its highest

ideals. The prophet often threatens the social order, the "way" things are. The prophet calls his community to remember its values and traditions in the face of their erosion. The prophet can function as a prick in the side of the power elite, for he functions without regard for social, political, or economic concerns, but as a call to idealistic, Utopic, and unchanging values.

In addition to individual prophecy, however, what functions as a reminder of the "old" way in the face of social upheaval and change? J. Lindblom has argued that the time of the Maccabees was an era without prophets: it is my contention that sectarian movements may function in the social role of the prophet.[227]

The CD community, then, functioned in the social role of the prophet. In response to alienating and frightening change, they issued a call to the traditions and values of the "old" way, and rejected the new and progressive way. In this way they are primitivists, or "conservatives," though in actually attempting to bring about a return to an "old" way, they may introduce new practices, beliefs, and forms of organization. In this way, they embody the age-old religious confrontation between tradition and change.

Sectarian movements, feeling threatened and alienated by social change, may reject change, and cling tenaciously to old traditions and values. This may be true even if the

old way is more imagined than actual, more idealized than real. They conjure up images of a glorified past, of a time when all was right, and envision a return to this perfected, idealized condition.

A sectarian movement, such as the CD community, may function within the Judeo-Christian tradition as a necessary tempering mechanism for those who would cast aside old traditions and values in the face of social change. A community, as "marginalized insider," may fulfill the precepts of its religious heritage more fully than any other community. A sectarian movement such as the CD community may arise as a necessary critical component of change in a society, tempering social change with an eye to the past and the highest ideal of the religion. Within the Judeo-Christian tradition, it may be that the social function of prophecy also finds its outlet in certain sectarian movements serving as adjuncts of inevitable social change.

In an interesting twist, however, the sect which yearns for the past often creates rather than preserves. This is not to indicate that the attempt to preserve is not made, or that the desire to preserve is not genuine, but rather to say that without gaining mainstream acceptance or without gaining some form of political power the sect's real contribution comes in the introduciton of new belief and practice. Though clamouring for the past, the CD community

was forced to introduce new practices. They introduced a life which foreshadowed life without the Temple, a life which revolved around dependency on the Torah and its interpretation to the exclusion of the actual use of the Temple. The CD community bore trends which later came to define the mainstream of Judaism. Forced by changing times to respond, the CD community became a vessel for change while decrying it. A conservative group, instead of preserving the past, may respond quickly to points of tension within a society and thereby quicken and foreshadow coming change.

But what, finally, does a sociological approach, and this approach in particular, tell us about the CD community and the nature of the religious experience? A sociological method, which takes seriously the irreducible nature of religion, points us to the universality of the religious response, the common and never-ending urge towards God. Men and women, generation after generation, in the face of alienating religion, do not discard religion but cling to it in an act of creativity and genius.

This act of adherence is the creativity and particular genius of the CD community. They protested the change in their religion, and bitterly withdrew from their religion, but they did not deny it. While some, or most, adherents of a religion are able to integrate change in belief and

practice into their worldview, to make sense of the new and "roll with the punches," some are not. The CD community was unable or unwilling to accept changes in what they considered to be the truth; they called the nation to fidelity. They called them to remain true to the way of the nation.

In the CD community we see a group of radicals, of "losers" in the game of religious power and prestige, but there is also evident a burning commitment to their religion. Though betrayed and alienated by the changes in their religion, they clung to it. They called to their God for deliverance from suffering. They attempted to create on earth a society free of sin, so that they could partake in an age free of pain. They hoped in the future.

Though they did not necessarily change or influence the Judaism of their day, they are a reminder of the constant and ongoing striving towards God and salvation. Were they losers? Though powerless and marginalized, they said of themselves:

> (these men) shall "rejoice and be glad," their heart shall be strong, and they shall prevail over all the inhabitants of the world; God shall pardon them and they shall see His deliverance, for they have taken refuge in His holy name (XX,33-34).

Their faith did not diminish, it supported them. In response to social forces beyond their control, they did not falter.

The dreams they harboured may have been ridiculous, and their response foolish, but it is in these dreams and strivings that the heart of the religious experience is met. To believe in, to hope in, to take refuge in, was enough for the CD community. The concepts of loser and winner are without meaning, "for they have taken refuge in His holy name." It is a refuge, this study has indicated, which people, year after year, generation after generation, continue to seek. The urge to God is not limited by time and place; it is the transcendent urge.

FOOTNOTES

[1]P. R. Davies, "Eschatology at Qumran," p. 55.

[2]Davies, "Eschatology," p. 55.

[3]Robin Scroggs, "The Sociological Interpretation of the New Testament," p. 179.

[4]Cyril Rodd, "On Applying a Sociological Theory to Biblical Studies," p. 106.

[5]Bruce J. Malina, "The Social Sciences and Biblical Interpretation," p. 234.

[6]John C. Kemeny and Paul Oppenheim, "On Reduction," pp. 6-7; argue that reduction is a positive phenomenon. Reduction, they believe, equals scientific progress because it increases factual knowledge through the addition of new scientific observations and improves upon the existing body of theory. This positive view of reductionism is not entertained in this study.

[7]Daniel Pals, "Reductionism and Belief," p. 18.

[8]Scroggs, "Sociological Interpretation" p. 166.

[9]Pals, "Reductionism and Belief," p. 28.

[10]Scroggs, "Sociological Interpretation," p. 165.

[11]Scroggs, "Sociological Interpretation," pp. 165-166.

[12]John G. Gager, "Shall We Marry Our Enemies?", p. 265.

[13]Gager, "Shall We Marry," p. 260.

[14]Rodd, "On Applying," p. 105.

[15]Malina, "The Social Sciences," p. 235.

[16]Scroggs, "Sociological Interpretation," p. 166.

[17]Malina, "The Social Sciences," pp. 232-233.

[18]Rodd, "On Applying," p. 98.

[19]Malina, "The Social Sciences," p. 232.

[20]Emile Durkheim, The Rules of Sociological Method, p. 99.

[21]Malina, "The Social Sciences," p. 233.

[22]Malina, "The Social Sciences," p. 233.

[23]Gager, "Shall We Marry," p. 260.

[24]Marcus Borg, Conflict, Holiness, and Politics in the Teachings of Jesus, p. 1-2.

[25]P. R. Davies, The Damascus Covenant, p. 3.

[26]Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality, p. 16.

[27]Robin Scroggs, "Sociological Interpretation," p. 166.

[28]Durkheim, Rules, p. 106.

[29]Durkheim, Rules, p. 110.

[30]Werner Stark, The Sociology of Knowledge, p. 244.

[31]Stark, Knowledge, p. 244.

[32]Ibid., Knowledge, p. 224.

[33]Gager, "Shall We Marry," p. 263.

[34]Gerard L. DeGre, Society and Ideology, p. 75.

[35]DeGre, Society, p. 84.

[36]DeGre, Society, p. 75.

[37]DeGre, Society, p. 73.

[38]Berger and Luckmann, The Social Construction, p. 169.

[39]Scroggs, "Sociological Interpretation," p. 175.

[40]Scroggs, "Sociological Interpretation," p. 175.

[41]Gregory Baum, Religion and Alienation, p. 91.

[42]Baum, Alienation, p. 86.

[43]Baum, Alienation, p, 75.

[44]Baum, Alienation, p. 132.

[45]Baum, Alienation, p. 90.

[46]Baum, Alienation, p. 90.

[47]Baum, Alienation, p. 31.

[48]Karl Mannheim, Ideology and Utopia, pp. 173 ff.

[49]Baum, Alienation, p. 107.

[50]Mannheim, Ideology, p. 236.

[51]Scroggs, "Sociological Interpretation," p. 167.

[52]Gager, "Shall We Marry," p. 259.

[53]Baum, Alienation, p. 111.

[54]Geza Vermes, "The Essenes and History," pp. 30-31. Vermes, citing Elias Bikerman, attributes the lack of history proper in the inter-testamental period to the loss of political autonomy.

[55]Vermes, "Essenes," p. 31. It is Arnaldo Momigliano who comments upon the type of history being written throughout Biblical history, that is, "what the Biblical historian did was to select from tradition those facts which seemed to him relevant to his interpretation of God's Order."

[56]This implies that what was selected was always factual; this was not always the case. The role of myth in the history of an ancient, or modern people for that matter, can never be discounted.

[57]Berger and Luckmann, The Social Construction," pp. 33-45. The decision to argue for "partial" social construction of language is mine, not Berger and Luckmann's.

[58]P. R. Davies, "The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document," p. 292. Davies believes that Stegemann's argument, even as a mere possibility, "confirms our decision not to include evidence about the Qumran community" in interpreting the CD. While this decision is adhered to in terms of the forthcoming textual survey, the dating procedure will take into account general textual studies.

[59]E. Wiesenberg, "Chronological Data in the Zadokite Fragments," p. 304.

[60]Davies, Damascus, pp. 26-27.

[61]Wiesenberg, as above, and R. North, "The Damascus of Qumran Geography," pp. 34-48.

[62]Isaac Rabinowitz, "A Reconsideration of 'Damascus' and '390 Years' in the 'Damascus' ('Zadokite') Fragments," pp. 13-14.

[63]Rabinowitz, "A Reconsideration," pp. 34-35.

[64]Davies, Damascus.

[65]Davies, Damascus, p. 198.

[66]Davies, Damascus, pp. 63 and 212, #15.

[67]Vermes, "Essenes," p. 25.

[68]Vermes, "Essenes," p. 25.

[69]Vermes, "Essenes," p. 20.

[70]Vermes, "Essenes," p. 20.

[71]Chaim Rabin, The Zadokite Fragments.

[72]Davies, Damascus, p. 4. Davies, however, does consider Rabin's translation the best in English.

[73]J. T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness Judaea, pp. 58-59.

[74]Davies, Damascus, p. 235. Davies does ask that his edition not be considered a critical edition; however, as he follows Rabin in general his decision to translate as "traitors" is significant.

[75]The Biblical quotation is found in Deut. 19:14 in the New Oxford Annotated Bible, which provides the information regarding the landmark. See also, Rabin, Zadokites, p. 4, #16, 2.

[76]W. L. Holladay, A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament, p. 265.

[77]Davies, Damascus, p. 90.

[78]Davies, Damascus, p. 91.

[79]Davies, "Temple," p. 290. Davies does not believe the CD community would reject the Temple in practice on any grounds of defilement. He gives two reasons: as a Jewish covenant community it would be difficult to worship without the Temple; and, to cease worship would be to relinquish control of the Temple to another party. I will argue later that, in fact, they did worship as a covenant community without the Temple; the formation of this attitude has already been hinted at in this chapter. Also, the Temple was already in "other" hands, the CD community had no control to relinquish.

[80]Davies, Damascus, pp. 150-155. Davies disagrees with the conclusion that the two houses are to be identified with two Hasidic factions, he believes that the two houses are Exilic in origin.

[81]A comment on "Damascus" as the place of exile is in order. There is no certainty whether an exile to Damascus did or did not take place, but I do not regard it as a serious problem one way or the other. With R. North, I would agree that what is important is that "the actual tenor of the Damascus references imply a real place, a real flight" (p. 41). An exile did take place; whether Damascus is "real" or allegorical is not as significant for a sociological study as the fact that the community felt impelled to go into exile.

[82]Victor Tcherikover, Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews, pp. 206-207.

[83]1 Maccabees 2:1-42.

[84]Davies, "Temple," p. 290.

[85]E. P. Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, p. 270.

[86]Section VIII,1-21 is reproduced in XIX,15-33, indicating the centrality the understanding of the nation as wicked had for the CD community. Because of the similarity of the passages, only VIII,1-21 will be examined.

[87]J. Murphy-O'Connor, "The Critique of the Princes of Judah," p. 207. Murphy-O'Connor claims that the term "princes of Judah" refers to the ruling classes of Jerusalem, including the priestly class. In support of our thesis, he says that the denunciation also refers to "the historical situation at the beginning of the reign of Jonathan" (p. 215). To the "princes of Judah," then, we

would add the priests of the Hasidic faction who supported Jonathan and denied the CD community.

[88]Sanders, Paul, p. 265.

[89]Lawrence Schiffman, Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 16. The revelation of the law is not comparable to the derivation of law in the Rabbinic tradition. "The Rabbinic point of view assumes that at Sinai, along with the revelation of the written law, an oral Law was also revealed which was then transmitted orally from Moses, and from generation to generation, until it reached the tannaim." Both dual revelation and the tradition of the "new" law are rejected in the Qumran material. The revelation of law not contained in the written Torah takes place in their study sessions; it is not derived from an oral law. Also although the rishonim, the early patriarchs, knew the correct interpretation of the Bible, it had long been lost. The CD community, however, claims no authority of tradition: they alone are recovering the true law.

[90]Sanders, Paul, p. 242.

[91]Schiffman, Sectarian Law, p. 16.

[92]Schiffman, Sectarian Law, p. 30.

[93]Schiffman, Sectarian Law, p. 31.

[94]Schiffman, Sectarian Law, p. 19.

[95]Schiffman, Sectarian Law, p. 9.

[96]Schiffman, Sectarian Law, p. 212.

[97]Murphy-O'Connor, "A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document VI,2 - VIII, 3," p. 218. P. R. Davies in "The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document," p. 295, while not agreeing with Murphy-O'Connor's explicit statement, agrees that the "Memorandum" is "a summary of the main points of the Laws."

[98]Schiffman, Sectarian Law, p. 213.

[99]Murphy-O'Connor, "Literary," p. 217.

[100]Davies, "Temple," p. 295.

[101]Davies, "Temple," p. 296.

[102]Davies, "Temple," p. 297.

[103]Davies, "Temple," p. 297.

[104]J. Murphy-O'Connor, "The Translation of the Damascus Document VI,11-14," pp. 553-556.

[105]Murphy-O'Connor, "Translation," p. 554.

[106]Murphy-O'Connor, "Translation," p. 555.

[107]Murphy-O'Connor, "Translation," p. 556.

[108]Murphy-O'Connor, "Literary," p. 214.

[109]Rabin, Zadokite, p. 58 note 21.4.

[110]The issue of a sectarian Temple does not arise in many scholars' works. The physical evidence is not convincing, and if our analysis of the CD community's attachment to the Jerusalem Temple is correct, the likelihood of them actually switching allegiance to a sectarian Temple is minimal.

[111]Rabin, Zadokite, p. 62 note 14.1

[112]Rabin, Zadokite, p. 62 note 9.2

[113]George Foot Moore, "The Covenanters of Damascus: A Hitherto Unknown Jewish Sect," pp. 330-377.

[114]Moore, The Covenanters, pp. 346-347.

[115]Moore, The Covenanters, pp. 373.

[116]Murphy-O'Connor, "Literary," p. 217.

[117]Rabin, Zadokite, p. 53 note 23.2. Rabin, here, gives one instance of a Sabbath law which the CD community interpreted more strictly.

[118]Murphy-O'Connor, "Literary," p. 217.

[119]Shemaryahu Talmon in "The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect From the Judaean Desert" has an excellent discussion on the specific form of calendation used at Qumran.

[120]Talmon, Calendar Reckoning, p. 198.

[121]Schiffman, Sectarian Law, p. 215.

[122]Rabin, Zadokite, p. 49 note 4.4

[123]Rabin, Zadokite, p. 67 note 15.1.

[124]Goran Forkman, The Limits of the Religious Community, p. 76.

[125]Bertil Gartner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament," p. 5.

[126]Joseph Baumgarten, Studies in Qumran Law, pp. 41-45.

[127]Forkman, Limits, p. 4.

[128]Davies, Damascus, p. 80.

[129]Schiffman, Sectarian Law, p. 2.

[130]Murphy-O'Connor, "Literary," p. 218.

[131]Schiffman, Sectarian Law, p. 211.

[132]Schiffman, Sectarian Law, p. 215.

[133]Schiffman, Sectarian Law, p. 215.

[134]J. Lindblom, Prophecy in Ancient Israel, pp. 411-412.

[135]Schiffman, Sectarian Law, p. 216.

[136]Schiffman, Sectarian Law, p. 216-217.

[137]Bryan Wilson, Patterns of Sectarianism, pp. 2-3.

[138]Bryan Wilson, Religion in Sociological Perspective, p. 101.

[139]Wilson, Religion, p. 105.

[140]Wilson, Religion, p. 113.

[141]Wilson, Patterns, pp. 2-3.

[142]Wilson, Patterns, p. 3.

[143]Wilson, Patterns, pp. 22-45; and Peter Berger, "The Sociological Study of Sectarianism," pp. 477-481. Wilson, in Patterns, lists the major classificatory studies of sectarianism, but the two listed here seem to be the most instructive and helpful.

[144]Leah Bronner, Sects and Separatism During the Second Jewish Commonwealth, p. 11f. Throughout Bronner's book, there is no indication, that I was able to find, of what she meant by sect. Though she calls, on page 11, sectarianism "an exaggerated form of separatism," neither term is defined. It is taken for granted that the meaning of the terms is self-evident.

[145]Wilson, Religion, p. 89.

[146]Benton Johnson, "A Critical Appraisal of the Church-Sect Typology," pp. 88-92. Johnson maintains, throughout his short paper, that the Church-Sect distinction is not fully understood or defined. His reformulations, though, are directed strictly toward the American sect. The basis of the Church-Sect distinction is maintained.

[147]Berger, "Sociological Study," p. 468.

[148]Berger, "Sociological Study," p. 468.

[149]Berger, "Sociological Study," p. 472.

[150]Wilson, Religion, p. 90.

[151]Wilson, Religion, p. 101.

[152]Wilson, Religion, p. 96.

[153]Emile Durkheim, The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life, pp. 94-95. Durkheim argues, also, that social facts cannot be understood if detached from their social system. They cannot be compared as things which resemble each other, but as common types.

[154]Wilson, Religion, pp. 91-92; and Scroggs, "Sociological Interpretation," p. 171. Both men have developed their list of characteristics from the basic model developed by Troeltsch. Berger, in "Studies," also offers a list of characteristics. The lists are, for the most part, the same, although the terminology is somewhat different. Often, where Scrogg's and Wilson's terminology gave a slightly different focus to the given characteristic, both men's interpretation was listed in the body of the thesis.

[155]Wilson, Religion, p. 115.

[156]Wilson, Patterns, pp. 17-18.

[157]Wilson, Patterns, pp. 30-31.

[158]Werner Stark, Studies in Religion: Vol. 2, p. 6.

[159]Stark, Studies, p. 5.

[160]Stark, Studies, p. 6.

[161]David Aberle, Millenial Dreams in Action, p. 209.

[162]Wilson, Religion, p. 93.

[163]Berger, "Sociological Study," p. 472.

[164]Samuel Iwry, "Was There a Migration to Damascus?", p. 88.

[165]Iwry, "Migration," p. 88.

[166]Baum, Alienation, p. 133.

[167]Davies, Damascus, p. 80.

[168]Wilson, Religion, p. 105.

[169]Bronner, Sects, p. 17.

[170]Wilson, Reiigion, p. 106.

[171]Scroggs, "Sociological Interpretation," p. 171.

[172]Bronner, Sects, p. 155.

[173]Berger, "Sociological Study," p. 472.

[174]Berger, "Sociological Study," p. 469.

[175]Wilson, Religion, p. 94.

[176]Berger, "Sociological Study," p. 482.

[177]Stephen Westerholm, Jesus and Scribal Authority, pp. 20-21. He says, "The Pharisaic sages intended that their traditions be observed, not by a closed group within Jewry, but by all Jews." The statement is qualified somewhat when he says, "a few regulations prompted by the non-observance of the masses and specifically directed towards the members of the havurot can properly be characterized as 'party law' in intention," but the general point holds.

[178]Schiffman, Sectarian Law, p. 31 and p. 215.

[179]Schiffman, Sectarian Law, p. 215.

[180]Gartner, The Temple, p. 5; Schiffman, Sectarian Law, p. 31; and George Foot Moore, "The Covenanters," p. 349.

[181]Sylvia Thrupp, Millenial Dreams in Action, p. 12; Berger, "Sociological Study," also, designates the eschaton in such terms, p. 484.

[182]Thrupp, Millenial, p. 25.

[183]Berger, "Sociological Study," p. 483.

[184]Wilson, Religion, p. 96.

[185]Berger, "Sociological Study," pp. 478-481.

[186]The following is Berger's outline of sectarian subtypes:

I. Enthusiastic: An Experience to be Lived

Type	Motif	Attitude Toward World
1a) Revivalist	"Fire falling from heaven"	World to be saved
1b) Pentecostal	"	"
2a) Pietist	"Follow the gleam"	World to be avoided
2b) Holiness	"	"

II. Prophetic: A Message to be Proclaimed

Type	Motif	Attitude Toward World
1) Chiliastic	"The Lord is coming"	World to be warned
2) Legalistic	"A new order"	World to be conquered

III. Gnostic: A Secret to be Divulged

Type	Motif	Attitude Toward World
1) Oriental	"Wisdom from the East"	World Irrelevant
2) New Thought	"Powers in the soul"	"
3) Spiritist	"Voices from beyond"	"

The Gnostic sects do not enter into the picture in a discussion of the CD community because, whatever other attributes they share, they certainly do not consider the world to be irrelevant.

[187]Berger, "Sociological Study," p. 479.

[188]Wilson, Patterns, p. 25f. Wilson, here, gives the best and most excellent analysis of sub-types.

[189]Wilson, Patterns, p. 26.

[190]Wilson, Patterns, p. 26.

[191]Wilson, Patterns, p. 26.

[192]Wilson, Patterns, p. 26.

[193]Wilson, Patterns, p. 27-29. The differences between the various sectarian types, as might be expected, are sometimes not readily apparent, as all sects do share many attributes in common. Therefore, the deciding factor is often the stress different communities place on similar attributes. Though the CD community does share some of the attributes of an "Introversionist" sect, in that it directed the attention of its followers away from the world, it was not typified by "reliance on inner illumination" which is the "dominating motif of an "Introversionist" sect. Wilson also says the "Introversionist" sect "considers itself an enlightened elect; inner values may be regarded as incommunicable and eschatological ideas are unarticulated or of little significance." In all these ways, the CD community differs. The "Introversionist" sect also is "indifferent to other religious movements," a trait not shared by the CD community.

[194]Franklin Littell, The Origins of Sectarian Protestantism, p. XVII. Littell's book still ranks as the best introduction to the history and meaning of Anabaptism. For the complete discussion of "what" Anabaptism is, Littell deals with the topic, in depth, in his Introduction and first chapter.

[195]Littell, Origins, p. 9.

[196]Littell, Origins, p. 64-65.

[197]Littell, Origins, p. 14.

[198]Littell, Origins, p. 15.

[199]Littell, Origins, p. 15.

[200]Littell, Origins, p. 91.

[201]Littell, Origins, p. 18.

[202]Littell, Origins, p. 62.

[203]Littell, Origins, p. 53.

[204]Littell, Origins, p. 109.

[205]Littell, Origins, p. 77.

[206]Littell, Origins, p. 48.

[207]Littell, Origins, p. 103.

[208]Littell, Origins, p. 41. The community did believe, however, that the truth to be apparent enough, that is, the truth was evident if the Bible was properly and openly read. There was no need for subjective reading of the text, or personal prophecy.

[209]Littell, Origins, p. 47.

[210]Littell, Origins, p. 89. Littell quotes H. Bohmer, an early Anabaptist leader, as saying: "Fourthly, we are agreed as to separation. It shall occur between (us) and the evil and the anxiety that the devil has planted in the world, in short, quite plainly we should not have community with them ..."

[211]Littell, Origins, p. 11.

[212]Littell, Origins, p. 97. An Anabaptist tract reads: "In conclusion ain and gmain builds the Lord's house and is rain, but aigen, mein, dein, and sein rends the house of the Lord and is unrain."

[213]Littell, Origins, pp. 96-97.

[214]Littell, Origins, p. 92.

[215]Littell, Origins, p. 86. For an excellent exposition of the ban and its use and authority, Littel reproduces a section of Balthasar Hubmaier's book on the subject. It also deals with the need for separation from sin.

[216]Wilson, Patterns, p. 14.

[217]Littell, Origins, p. 44-45.

[218]Davies, "Eschatology," pp. 54-55.

[219]Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "An Essene Missionary Document?", pp. 201-229; and Iwry, "Migration."

[220]Iwry, "Migration," p. 83.

[221]Murphy-O'Connor, "Missionary," p. 201. This is the best, and as far as I know, the only article to discuss the CD as a missionary document. It is interesting that Murphy-O'Connor came to this conclusion through strictly literary grounds, because sociological theory, from a completely different perspective, seems to support his argument.

[222]Scroggs, "Sociological Interpretation," p. 167.

[223]Peter Burke, Sociology and History, p. 30.

[224]Raymond Brown, "The Messianism of Qumran," p. 53.

[225]Durkheim, Rules, p. 110.

[226]Durkheim, Rules, p. 106.

[227]Lindblom, Prophecy, p. 218.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baum, Gregory. Religion and Alienation: A Theological Reading of Sociology. New York: Paulist Press, 1975.

Baumgarten, Joseph M. Studies in Qumran Law. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977.

Berger, Peter and Luckmann, Thomas. The Social Construction of Reality. Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday, 1966.

Berger, Peter L. "The Sociological Study of Sectarianism" in Social Research 21 (1954), 467-487.

Borg, Marcus. Conflict, Holiness, and Politics in the Teachings of Jesus. New York: E. Mellen Press, 1984.

Bronner, Leah. Sects and Separatism During the Second Jewish Commonwealth. New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1967.

Brown, Raymond. "The Messianism of Qumran" in Catholic Biblical Quarterly 19 (1957), 53-82.

Burke, Peter. Sociology and History. London: Allen & Unwin, 1980.

Charlesworth, James H. "The Origin and Subsequent History of the Authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Four Transitional Phases Among the Qumran Essenes" in Revue Qumran 10 (1980), 213-233.

Davies, P. R. The Damascus Covenant. Sheffield: JSOT Supplement Series, 1983.

_____. "Eschatology at Qumran" in Journal of Biblical Literature 104/1 (1985), 39-55.

_____. "The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document" in Essays in Honour of Y. Yadin, Journal of Jewish Studies 33 (1982), 287-301.

DeGre, Gerard L. Society and Ideology: An Inquiry Into the Sociology of Knowledge. New York: Columbia University Bookstore, 1943.

Durkheim, Emile. The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1968.

_____. The Rules of Sociological Method. New York: Free Press, 1966.

Forkman, Goran. The Limits of the Religious Community: Expulsion from the Religious Community within the Qumran Sect, within Rabbinic Judaism, and within Primitive Christianity. Lund: Gleerup, 1972.

Gager, John G. "Shall We Marry Our Enemies? Sociology and the New Testament" in Interpretation XXXVI/3 (1982), 256-266.

Gartner, Bertil. The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1965.

Iwry, Samuel. "Was There a Migration to Damascus? The Problem of " in Eretz-Israel IX (Albright Volume). Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1969.

Johnson, Benton. "A Critical Appraisal of the Church-Sect Typology" in American Sociological Review (February 1957), 88-92.

Josephus. Jewish Antiquities: Volume 7. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1935.

Kemeny, John C. and Oppenheim, Paul. "On Reduction" in Philosophical Studies 7 (1956), 6-19.

Lewy, Gunter. Religion and Revolution. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Lindblom, J. Prophecy in Ancient Israel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1962.

Littell, Franklin. The Origins of Sectarian Protestantism. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1964.

Malina, Bruce J. "The Social Sciences and Biblical Interpretation" in Interpretation XXXVI/3 (1982), 229-242.

Mannhein, Karl. Ideology and Utopia. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1936.

Milik, J. T. Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1959.

Moore, George Foot. "The Covenanters of Damascus: A Hitherto Unknown Jewish Sect" in Harvard Theological Review (1911), 330-377.

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document VI,2-VIII,3" in Revue Biblique 78 (1971), 210-232.

_____. "An Essene Missionary Document? CD II,14 - VI,1" in Revue Biblique 77 (1970), 201-229.

_____. "The Critique of the Princes of Judah" in Revue Biblique 79 (1972), 200-216.

_____. "The Translation of Damascus Document VI,11-14" in Revue de Qumran 7 (1971), 553-556.

North, Robert. "The Damascus of Qumran Geography" in Palestine Exploration Quarterly 87 (1955), 34-48.

Pals, Daniel. "Reductionism and Belief: An Appraisal of Recent Attacks on the Doctrine of Irreducible Religion" in The Journal of Religion 66/1 (1986), 18-36.

Penner, H. H. and Yonan, E. A. "Is a Science of Religion Possible?" in Journal of Religion 52 (1972), 107-133.

Rabin, Chaim. The Zadokite Documents. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1958.

Rabinowitz, Isaac. "A Reconsideration of 'Damascus' and '390 Years' in the 'Damascus' ('Zadokite') Fragments" in Journal of Biblical Literature 73 (1954), 11-35.

Rodd, Cyril. "On Applying a Sociological Theory to Biblical Studies" in JSOT 19 (1981), 95-106.

Sanders, E. P. Paul and Palistinian Judaism. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977).

Schiffman, Lawrence H. Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1983.

Schurer, Emil. Millar, et al., eds. The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ. Volume I. Edinburth: T & T Clark Ltd., 1973.

_____. Black, et al., eds. The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ. Edinburth: T & T Clark Ltd., 1973.

Scroggs, Robin. "The Sociological Interpretation of the New Testament: The Present State of the Research" in New Testament Studies 26 (1980), 164-179.

Smith, Morton. "The Dead Sea Sect in Relation to Ancient Judaism" in New Testament Studies 7 (1960-1), 347-360.

Stark, Werner. The Sociology of Knowledge. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1958.

_____. The Sociology of Religion: II, Sectarian Religion. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1967.

Talmon, Shermaryahu. "The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judaean Desert" in Scripta Hierosolymitana: Volume 4 Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Jerusalem: At the Magnes Press, 1965.

Tchericover, Victor. Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews. New York: A Temple Book, 1975.

Thrupp, Sylvia, ed. Millenial Dreams in Action: Studies in Revolutionary Religious Movements. New York: Schocken Books, 1970.

Vermes, Geza. "The Essenes and History" in Journal of Jewish Studies 32 (1981), 18-31.

Westerholm, Stephen. Jesus and Scribal Authority. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1978.

Wiesenberg, E. "Chronological Data in the Zadokite Fragments" in Vetus Testamentum 5 (1955), 284-308.

Wilson, Bryan, ed. Patterns of Sectarianism: Organisation and Ideology in Social and Religious Movements. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd., 1967.

_____. Religion in Sociological Perspective. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.